

BLASPHEMY OF SRILA PRABHUPADA

INTRODUCTION

If I were to desist from lecturing about the Absolute Truth due to fear that some listeners may be displeased, I would be deviating from the path of Vedic truth and accepting the path of untruth. I would become one who is inimical to the Vedas, an atheist, and would no longer possess faith in Bhagavan, the very embodiment of truth. **He who compromises is finished.** *Srila Bhaktisiddhanta Vaibhava*

As it does, the [Srila Prabhupada's] goal of creating a viable cultural alternative to mainstream American culture will cease to exist.
(Rochford, pg. 158-9)

The [linked document](#) is about a major historic controversy that took place in late 1999 and early 2000. The lack of action by the GBC, especially the GBC EC has had a lasting detrimental effect on ISKCON, more on that later.

Some points not covered in it but noteworthy are:

Because statements from Srila Prabhupada and sastra had previously defeated ISKCON feminists they decided to undermine the authority of both in order to have their way.

The GBC EC at the time included **Bir Krsna Gosvami** (chairman). They not only did nothing to stop the blasphemy but also actively protected the culprits Madhusudhani Radha dd (aka Maria Ekstrand owner of the CHAKRA website) and others.

The North American GBC dominated by feminists like Bir Krsna Gosvami, Ravindra Svarupa, Malati dd, and Anuttama Prabhu protected their fellow travellers - the blasphemers of Srila Prabhupada.

The abusers of Srila Prabhupada were all members of the **Women's Ministry** (now strategically renamed Vaisnavi Ministry) or supporters of it. This is a GBC funded ministry.

Not even one female devotee (senior or junior) spoke up in defense of Srila Prabhupada. That includes Malati dd (who was a new GBC!), Vishakha dd,

Laxmimoni dd, Sudharma dd, Urmila dd, Narayani dd, Prasanta dd, etc. None of them. They are all members of the Women's (Vaisnavi) Ministry.

The Women's ministry had employed Madhusudhani Radha dd to write a paper in which she selectively quoted texts out of context to character assassinate those who objected to the rise of feminism in ISKCON. [In a private forum she admitted to doing so, see copy of her text at end*.]

Silence implies agreement.

Bir Krsna Gosvami is now at the forefront of pushing to make these same women gurus in ISKCON. And is on the committee to write ISKCON's defining statement on the matter of Female Diksha Guru.

[As a point of interest during Bir Krsna Goswami's tenure as GBC EC chairman, along with blatant blasphemy of Srila Prabhupada, all the cows on Murari Sevaka where he was GBC were sold for slaughter, the Turley Case was launched against ISKCON, and the GBC EC's hardline position on Rtvikism started what has become a 14 year long court battle. Not a good year for him or ISKCON.]

Ravindra Svarupa Prabhu effectively blocked any attempt to expel those who blasphemed Srila Prabhupada.

Hrdayananda Dasa Gosvami and the late Bhakti Tirtha Goswami spoke in defense of the main culprit Madhusudhani Radha dd.

In 2004 when a motion was put forward to censure Madhusudhani Radha dd, after it was found that she not only blasphemed Srila Prabhupada but also Lord Rama again Ravindra Svarupa Dasa along with Braja Bihari Dasa (ISKCON Resolve) successfully persuaded the GBC not to do so.

[A link to the Madhusudhani Radha's feminist take on Lord Rama (she is not too thrilled with Lord Krsna either) – caution extremely toxic and offensive.
<http://www.harekrsna.com/sun/editorials/05-08/madhusudani.doc>]

Ironically Ravindra Svarupa Dasa, is on the GBC committee for preserving the position of Srila Prabhupada. Why ironic, because he has done so much to destroy it.

Ravindra Svarupa Dasa, is considered the “wise old man” of the GBC. He sees himself as the senior statesman of ISKCON. But he didn't foresee the negative consequences of his policy though everyone else could.

Burke Rochford devoted a whole section of his book *Hare Krishna Transformed* to this debacle. Here he explains why the GBC failed to come to Srila Prabhupada's defense (emphasis mine).

One GBC member hinted at the reasons **why the leadership failed** to respond when he declared, “I hereby confess I came to find these reactions, ‘in defense of Srila Prabhupada,’ equally—no, even more so—troubling and upsetting than that which occasioned them.” As this statement implies, ISKCON’s leaders found themselves in an uncomfortable position, as pursuing a vigorous and public defense of Prabhupada meant aligning themselves with GHQ and its controversial agenda. One GBC member decided, “They are like the John Birch Society, and we didn’t want to raise their visibility and status. Plus it was **politically safe** just to ignore them, and we did”. (Rochford, p 157)

This GBC insultingly equates those who want to preserve the parampara to the John Birch Society – right wing extremists.

The GBC EC thought that those who were upset that Srila Prabhupada was insulted were worse than those who insulted Srila Prabhupada so they chose to do nothing when the Acarya was abused, loving feminism more than Srila Prabhupada.

And while the GBC EC may have thought it politically safe to ignore those who objected to Srila Prabhupada being insulted in his own house what was the result of this political ploy on ISKCON (emphasis mine)?

Such a cultural turn is significant because it signals the ways in which traditionalism [the parampara] no longer serves as the foundation of ISKCON’s religious culture. In embracing gender equality, ISKCON’s leaders **aligned the organization with a defining feature of modern liberal culture**. ... The debate about women’s roles and place in ISKCON led to critical questioning of Prabhupada’s scriptural commentaries, as well as to his overall authority as Krishna’s pure representative. **The fact that the leadership failed to act decisively on Prabhupada’s behalf was an acknowledgment that his authority no longer was absolute**. ... Yet as these teachings become reframed as guides for thought and action, in place of being “absolute truths,” traditionalism [the parampara] will continue its march to the margins of ISKCON. **As it does, the goal of creating a viable cultural alternative to mainstream American culture will cease to exist**. (Rochford, pg. 158-9)

Basically what Rochford is saying is that unless the damage done by the GBC EC of 1999-2000 (Bir Krsna Goswami) and their feminist fellow travellers is reversed then ISKCON as an instrument in Lord Caintanya’s mission is dead but doesn’t know it yet.

Note: Rochford's is a highly one sided and biased book, he did not bother to contact anyone who supported the view of the parampara but rather only those of ISKCON feminists and secularists. Still it is very revealing in describing how much the leadership in North America has deviated from the guru parampara. To illustrate, one NA GBC leader said this:

"Let's face it, twenty years ago what the GHQ is saying was accepted. It was the way we thought. But there has been a gradual, steady, historical transformation. There has been a gradual and peaceful shift in ISKCON, in the Prabhupada hermeneutic. Given the extreme sensitivity of some of these issues, I think the GBC is relieved that this shift has occurred." (Rochford, p 157)

(Which NA GBC would use a word like "hermeneutic?") So what he is saying is that 20-25 years ago most of ISKCON was supporting the vision of the guru paramapara. But gradually in due course of time the leaders especially of the North American GBC which dominates the GBC, fell into maya. They didn't have the spiritual stamina to resist the pressures of the secular world they were preaching to and instead became compromised and coopted with maya. Rather than admit their inability and weakness and just resign and let more dedicated persons lead, they instead call anyone who still wants to carry the message of the guru parampara right wing fanatics and extremists.

When I first read Bhagavad-gita 4.2:

This supreme science was thus received through the chain of disciplic succession, and the saintly kings understood it in that way. But in course of time the **succession was broken**, and therefore the science as it is appears to be lost.

I could not imagine how a disciple would be so disloyal to his guru that he would deviate from the message of the guru parampara. But now I am seeing it with my own eyes.

Since the GBC EC (Bir Krsna Gosvami), and the rest of the NA GBC (Ravindra Swarupa, Anuttama, Malati) preferred to protect a vile blasphemer of Lord Rama and Srila Prabhupada it is no surprise that they have perverted and broken the guru parampara.

Reference:

Rochford, E. Burke Jr. 2007. *Hare Krishna Transformed*, New York, NY, New York University Press

Download it for free from:

<http://www.scribd.com/doc/155912876/Hare-Krishna-Transformed-by-E-Burke-Rochford-Jr>

Footnotes:

*

From: Maria Ekstrand [mariaekstrand@earthlink.net]

Sent: Tuesday, May 28, 2002 1:53 PM

To: topical-discussions@yahoogroups.com

Subject: Re: [TD] Urmila's article

At 04:58 PM 5/28/02 +0000, you wrote:

> Also, I believe that he was part of the Cakra committee who
> published the GHQ expose -- another important public service act.

What is this expose?

It's something I wrote a few years ago after being given access to a secret COM conference, in which Shyam and others were plotting to destroy the women's ministry. They called themselves GHQ (General Headquarters) because they saw themselves as some kind of paramilitary organization. It's actually quite humorous how stupid they are....

Madhu

ps. Ardhabuddi das means basically "servant of the halfbrains" or "halfintelligent"

See also the material at this link which shows how the Women's ministry acquired the texts. It was later revealed by Hariballabha dd that the COM sysop's wife Mukhya dd, at the request of the Women's Ministry turned over all the texts to them.

<http://www.vnn.org/editorials/ET9902/5.htm#a25>

In Defense of Srila Prabhupada

"I request that devotees that think that this permissive attitude that allows this blatant depicting of our founding acarya in such an offensive light--write to the overseers of COM itself, in the hopes that bringing it to their attention will end this great slap in our beloved guru's face. To hear from several devotees in protest will get their attention."

Mahananda Dasa, October 19, 1999, Topical Discussions

Dear Followers of Srila Prabhupada,

Please accept our humble obeisances. All glories to Srila Prabhupada.

The purpose of this letter is to inform you of actions meant to denigrate Srila Prabhupada's revered position in the Krsna consciousness movement. The greatest concern is that it is not an assault originating from outside the movement but rather it is being powered by ISKCON-initiated devotees through comments appearing on various conferences on the ISKCON/BBT website, COM (which has been recently renamed PAMHO.COM).

The situation has been quietly debated by various leaders of the Hare Krsna movement via the Internet for several months. As a result, some of the discussions have now become public resulting in a fear that a divided GBC will not act decisively over such a basic and important issue. The situation has become so grave that two GBC members have tendered their resignations ([47](#), [48](#)) due to frustration at the GBC Body's inaction and indecisiveness.

Accompanying this letter is an attachment that contains a representation of email messages

exchanged between the above-mentioned devotees along with some of the conferences' postings which originally sparked the fierce debate. We acknowledge that we cannot be in possession of every exchange; however, based on the information at hand, we feel justified in making our concerns and the available information public. We apologize to any correspondent who may be upset that letters they felt were private are now being publicized. Since most of the emails were sent to a large group of devotees and then shared by some with a larger audience, we feel these letters have already been made public and feel obligated to participate in the discussion. Please realize our motivation is to educate, discuss and publicize these issues as an effort to halt the offensive statements being made against Srila Prabhupada.

This letter is a summary of events occurring over the last two years on COM and presents correspondence dating from approximately October, 1999 between various leaders in the movement. As we make different points, a reference number will be cited referring to an accompanying attachment where the original writing is catalogued. You need only click on the link to view the hypertext.

On May 3, 1999, Jivan Mukta dasa wrote an open letter to the GBC Body which was published on the VNN web page. Contained in this letter were many shocking statements from a conference entitled Vaisnava Advanced Studies (VAST) which occurred during early 1998. The details ([Ref.1](#)) were leaked from an otherwise private conference due to an unnamed individual's concern over various statements and proposals being made in that conference. Membership in the conference consists mainly, but not entirely, of devotees holding post-graduate.

Much of the discussion revealed by Jivan Mukta dasa's letter revolved around women's intelligence and their role in society as presented in Srila Prabhupada's books. Srila Prabhupada's teachings were portrayed as sexist and these "scholars" suggested that some of Prabhupada's ideas were conditioned by his learning at Scottish Churches College. One postulated that in order for Prabhupada's teachings to be considered true they had to be supported and proven by both scripture and scientific study ([ref.1, text 9](#), Advaita dasa). Shortly thereafter, Madhusdani Radha d.d. (MRdd) wrote:

"If Prabhupada was not referring to spiritual intelligence, or to what we typically think of as material intelligence (IQ), then I can not comment on whether he was right or wrong.

However, if you really think this is the case, I have one suggestion: Change the books. The way they are currently written will be interpreted by the majority of people to mean option #2 above. If this is not what we want them to say, we need to indicate that very clearly. Otherwise we will lose many, many souls who will have been unable to see beyond that miscommunication."

During these same discussions, MRdd., advised GBC member Prithu dasa that: "if you want to distance yourself from what Amavasya quoted you as saying, or from Prabhupada's statements about the reasons for the 95 - 100 female to male ratio in India, I would encourage you to do so on both VAST and IWC..." Prithu dasa's response was to declare that he would never disassociate himself from Srila Prabhupada.

These VAST statements are shocking and the participants defend them by emphasizing that the conference was private and that for the sake of brainstorming an unrestricted environment and dialogue are required. However, the authors of this paper disagree and encourage the readers to refer to an email written by Bhakti Vikasa Swami ([40](#)) detailing the traditional, respectful and vaisnava-like method of discussing and understanding the message of an acarya. The process undertaken by MRdd, some VAST members and others are in direct contradiction to the reverential form of inquiry traditionally found in our parampara and we must caution everyone that abandoning this tradition is fraught heavily with spiritual risk and infamy.

In reference [34](#), Madhusudani Radha d.d. defends the VAST discussion to GBC Executive Chairman Bir Krsna dasa Goswami. However, claims contained in that letter do not tally up when a larger assortment of her statements are brought under review as noted by Hari Sauri dasa ([55](#)). During her presentation, she inaccurately states that the discussion to change Srila Prabhupada's books was restricted only to the VAST conference. Rather, her idea

about footnoting Srila Prabhupada's books was repeated in the varnasrama conference on May 3/99 (2) but with a different focus than during the VAST discussion. There she stated:

"Similarly, some kind of footnotes should be inserted to suggest different ways of understanding what he meant by his "women are less intelligent" statements and the comment about women liking to be raped among others. E.G. is it material intelligence, spiritual intelligence or something completely different? Those are the things scholars will notice and react to."

It is evident by her employment of the word *similarly* that she is not referring to the footnoting of Srila Prabhupada's book in the same manner as claimed in her letter to the GBC Chairman, that is, along the lines of an outdated use of the words "he" and "she." The readers must be aware that the initial VAST claim for footnoting Srila Prabhupada's books was made in early 1998 and again repeated in May of 1999 by MRdd in an open devotional forum. As such, the claim that it is part of a brainstorming exercise holds no merit and invalidates Jayapataka Swami's acceptance of MRdd's defense that the VAST statements reflect ideas and statements only voiced 24 months earlier (41).

It would be inaccurate to think that criticism of Srila Prabhupada has been monopolized solely by those on the VAST forum. Recently, Madhusudani Radha d.d. organized a conference entitled "Topical Discussions." Initially, the conference was public but then made private (at least partially) after Dhyanakunda d.d. openly expressed strongly worded doubts and criticisms of Srila Prabhupada. Some of the issues were refuted by Nayana-ranjana das (53) and others. We caution the devotees to take caution in reading Dhyanakunda d.d.'s comments due to her improper attitude towards Srila Prabhupada. Another devotee (Mahananda dasa), who defended Srila Prabhupada and dared challenge Dhyanakunda d.d.'s claims, was deported from the Topical Discussion conference by MRdd. MRdd's defense was:

"Although other people may see Prabhupada as more of a human being and less 'god-like' than you do and they may feel that he has made mistakes about material matters, without feeling that this detracts from his ability to give us Krsna, *you* have taken it upon yourself to judge that this constitutes an offense (4)" plus "I do want you there, but without the threats and put downs. You do have something to contribute and your literalism is a welcome viewpoint (but it's not the only one). So is your deification of Prabhupada. But it's equally acceptable for some to see Prabhupada as an empowered human being who made some material mistakes but who nevertheless is able to give us Krsna (5)."

To criticize Mahananda dasa as deifying Srila Prabhupada is unacceptable and in direct contradiction to all Vedic injunctions. As well, this statement makes folly of her spiritual master's claim that she is studying Prabhupada's books. There is certainly no evidence of sastric erudition in either her statement or attitude.

Further evidence of her being out of touch with our tradition manifested while communicating with Vyapaka dasa, who had already run into MRdd's attitude towards Srila Prabhupada in the varnasrama conference, when requesting membership to Topical Discussions. He received the following response (7) when she outlined her standard for membership in the conference:

"All sources of evidence are acceptable, inc. sastra, science, and one's own brain and logic

and no one gets to criticize anyone else for that. You may disagree with other people's opinions or facts, but you have to do so in a respectful way. If someone says for example that they have concerns about places in which Prabhupada appears to be contradicting himself, you may explain why you don't see any contradiction, but you may not say that these people are ruining their spiritual lives by even suggesting that Prabhupada could do such a thing."

In the end, Vyapaka dasa was refused access to the conference by both Madhusudani Radha and her co-moderator, Dvaipayana Vyasa dasa, even after agreeing to follow their free speech provision. Refer to Dvaipayana Vyasa dasa's reaction ([10](#)) to Dhyanakunda d.d.'s contribution in the Topical Discussion conference ([3](#)). It is evident that neither of these two individuals possess the spiritual maturity nor the proper respect for the acaryas in our line which must be prerequisites to moderating a Krsna conscious conference on an ISKCON subsidized web site. COM's standard of qualification for moderating conferences must be elevated beyond the existing standard of owning a computer and having facility to log onto the Internet.

Madhusudani Radha d.d.'s assault on Srila Prabhupada was again prominent when commenting on the varnasrama conference ([2](#)) when she offered: "I saw that he hinted at a "part 2" in which he'd show that I'm unable to absolve Srila Prabhupada of any responsibility for the gurukula abuses. I can save him the trouble. Although the lion's share of the burden obviously rests with the abusers themselves, I do think that *everyone* who was in ISKCON at the time shoulders some of the blame. So there, Jivanmukta (if someone leaks this to you), I've admitted it." She expressed the same exact sentiment elsewhere as noted by a GBC member when she cites Srila Prabhupada as being at least partially responsible for the child abuse undertaken in the movement ([13](#)). It should be mentioned that these comments have been made even after she was informed by an ex-gurukula headmaster that he had been severely chastised by Srila Prabhupada for being too heavy a disciplinarian with them.

Her disrespect for Srila Prabhupada is unavoidable and these statements disqualify her from any responsible position in ISKCON. Similarly, this shows that the COM Sysop, Raktambara dasa, is seriously derelict in his responsibility to administer COM.

Indeed, MRdd's overall attitude towards vaisnavas is off-base. To understand her mind set, one needs to simply read her analysis of a study at a clinic in Mumbai where she speculates that the majority of patients were vaisnavas ([6](#)). This is extremely distasteful and reveals a perverse and unscholarly attitude. How are we to understand that a person harboring such feelings about Srila Prabhupada and vaisnavas be allowed so much freedom to regulate discussion on public conferences?

We would be remiss if we were to leave the impression that MRdd. was alone in these type of comments. Unfortunately, these types of remarks are widespread and so similar in nature that it purports to be the workings of a cabal. An identical rationale has been uttered by the likes of Harsi dasa ([8, 9](#)), Dvaipayana Vyasa dasa ([10](#)), Hare Krsna dasi ([11](#)) and in various other COM conferences ([12](#)) including (as alluded to by MRdd in her letter to Prithu dasa) VAST and the International Women's Conference, in addition to Topical Discussions, Varnasrama, German and Slovenian conferences.

A distressing side issue is that many of the statements questioning Srila Prabhupada and his books originate from some of the main proponents involved in the debate concerning the role of women in the movement. During the course of that debate, many modern ideas regarding their role in society were revealed to be fallacious after thorough study and citation of Srila Prabhupada's writings. It is a shared realization by many that the

denigration of Srila Prabhupada's position in the movement referred to above arises from the ashes of those defeated arguments. We pray that those proponents have not now decided to besmirch Srila Prabhupada's absolute position in the movement as a means to bring change to the movement synonymous with their modern perspective. As a result, obvious complications arose for different leaders in the movement who agreed with the idea of changing the women's role, while now realizing that the same individuals prominent in the women's debate are now instrumental in chipping away at Srila Prabhupada's authority. This is evident not so much from comments being made but rather by the reticence of various individuals known to be sympathetic to changing the traditional role of women. That these champions for an expanded women's role were now referring to Srila Prabhupada in an unbecoming manner must have caused these leaders concern. At least, hopefully so.

Let us be clear! Our intention is not to rehash the debate over the role of women in the movement. Yet we cannot help but note the recurrence of remarks typifying Srila Prabhupada as being conditioned by his education or traditional upbringing ([1](#)) and at other times remarks offering deference to Srila Prabhupada's spiritual authority but coupled with remarks alleging material mistakes and misconceptions by individuals ([8,9,10,11](#), etc.) involved in the discussion on women issues. Whether these comments stem from a misunderstanding or a mischievous maneuver does not matter; they must come to a halt!

Due to concern over this effort to minimize Srila Prabhupada, various members of the GBC were notified. As a result, a long discourse began on how to regulate COM. According to the material in our archives, Sivarama Swami was the first off the mark ([16](#)) with his characterization of the comments being "poisonous rhetoric" and he points out the need to deal with this concept of Prabhupada offering material and spiritual guidance. He concluded that MRdd.'s spiritual master, Jayapataka Swami, be consulted to see what he is doing to remedy the situation. Hari Sauri dasa, Prithu dasa, Bhakta Brnga Govinda Swami, Guru Prasada Swami, and Bhakti Caru Swami all joined in the defense of Srila Prabhupada each suggesting action needed to be taken.

Discussion went back and forth on the form of action to take with suggestions including:

- 1) Closing of all COM conferences
- 2) Suspending MRdd and colleagues from use of COM
- 3) Establishment of a commission to perform further investigations
- 4) Using expulsion as a means of punishment for those implicated in these activities
- 5) Etc. (31)

The breaking of ISKCON laws 8.4.8.1 & 8.4.8.2 were cited ([26](#)) as the offenses which would allow remedial action. A reading of the various emails listed in the attachment will provide a better understanding of the course of discussion.

On the practical side, certain letters stand out more than others. Letters from Brahma Muhurta dasa ([18](#), [19](#)), North European BBT Trustee explain that COM was established as a means for the NE BBT to communicate for publishing Srila Prabhupada's books but not for the use of public conferences or spreading Krsna consciousness. He even agreed ([18](#)) that he had no objection to closing all of the conferences ([19](#)) and COM sysop Raktambara

affirms that control over the COM is in the hands of the BBT. So whatever the decision of the GBC may be, there seems to be a clear cut line of authority in regards to both administration and ISKCON law to effect change.

However, Jayapataka Swami, who initiated MRdd, expresses concern that the VAST statements before him are outdated (41) and in earlier statements states that he feels that expelling someone or closing COM conferences are extreme measures (30). But rather, he suggests, let a basic etiquette or protocol be established since expulsion seems like something from the past (31). It is possible to understand his comments numbered 30 & 31 if he hadn't been made aware of the overall trend of the many remarks listed above and due to his obvious concern for his disciple.

But his suggestions in 30 & 31 were strongly replied to both by Prithu dasa (35) and by Shyamasundara dasa (astrologer) in 38. It is therefore difficult to comprehend his understanding, especially Shyamasundara dasa's, that he can still hold the opinion that offensive remarks only occurred during the VAST discussion (41). On Dec. 21/99, though making some suggestions to control COM, he continues to express that the controversy is limited to VAST and remarks how MRdd's defense of the VAST statements suffice as clarification (46). Several conclusions can be drawn from this. Either he is selectively reading his mail and has missed many letters explaining the overall situation (for your information, Shyamasundara dasa's explanation was sent to Jayapataka Swami by two other GBC members, a temple President and twice by Shyamasundara dasa) or he is declining to consider all of the evidence. Whichever the case, the obvious conclusion that we arrive at is that due to his not considering, or not knowing about, the variety of offenses committed by MRdd and others, his opinion is ill-informed and he has become part of the problem rather than part of the solution. For an impassioned but cogent review of this situation read a [letter](#) to Jayapataka Swami from Shyamasundara dasa.

At this time things begin to get confused. The bulk of the writings to this point were in agreement that some action had to be taken though opinions differ on method. But on Dec.14, 1999, Bir Krsna dasa Goswami, GBC Executive Committee Chairman writes that "Previously I tried to close down all public conferences but was not allowed to do so" (42). Not allowed to do so?! Unfortunately, the person(s) who didn't allow him to do so is not described and this statement puts Prithu dasa's comment of the same date that "As for COM it is definitely within our domain, ability and as such responsibility to see that its members are observant of (Vaisnava) etiquette and its conferences are being properly conducted (if needed moderated) just like any government, any corporation or church would do (43)" into doubt.

So who is actually in charge of COM? According to Bir Krsna das Goswami, it is not the GBC Executive and according to Prithu dasa it is the GBC. Simultaneously, the BBT Trustee, Brahma Muhurta dasa expressed no qualms on severe action in managing the public conferences. Then on Feb. 2, 2000, Raktambara dasa, COM Sysop makes a public announcement:

"From February 1, 2000 onwards, the North European BBT (NE BBT) leases its e-mail infrastructure (previously known as The BBT E-mail Systems) to their respective System Operators (SysOps), who run it as the Bhaktivedanta E-mail Services. The SysOps maintain the system in all aspects, and define its policies. In other words, although the NE BBT is the owner of the infrastructure, the NE BBT is not managing or governing The Bhaktivedanta E-mail Services (see note 1)....

Note1:

Another point, which is somewhat related: The Bhaktivedanta E-mail Services are on friendly terms with ISKCON, but are not a part of it. Therefore, The Bhaktivedanta E-mail Services are not governed by the ISKCON Governing Body Commission. Our facilitating the GBC on our mail network has been interpreted by some GBC members as our being subjected to the GBC. This is an unfortunate misunderstanding. Until further notice, we are on friendly terms with but independent from the ISKCON GBC. (Our infrastructure provider, the BBT, is also -- by Srila Prabhupada's direct instruction -- separate from ISKCON and independent from the management of the GBC.)" (49)

It is not clear what is specifically meant by Raktambara dasa's challenging statement "Until further notice, we are on friendly terms with but independent from the ISKCON GBC" but the meaning of the change in organization is clear. How can such a radical re-organization occur without the knowledge and consent of the GBC? What type of game is Brahma Muhurta dasa, BBT Trustee, and Raktambara dasa playing? It is remarkable that such action is being taken while an ongoing discussion by leaders of the Hare Krsna movement about offenses to Srila Prabhupada on COM is being conducted. We do not know presently if Brahma Muhurta dasa and Raktambara dasa agree with MRdd in her assessment of Srila Prabhupada but we are certain that MRdd is happy with the change on COM.

Two days after publication of this notice from Raktambara dasa, MRdd writes to Ameyatma dasa responding to some points made to her during an earlier email. An excerpt is as follows:

Ameyatma dasa:

Guru-Sadhu-Shastra is what ISKCON is based on, from the ground up. There is no place for mental concoctions. If you want some modern non-authorized forum, do so outside of ISKCON's COM and BBT funding.

MRdd.:

We are. The COM is not under GBC control and now it's no longer run by the BBT either. It's been leased to the system operators and will be financed by user donations. So I guess there is no more issue to discuss.

(Please read Ameyatma dasa's full response to her letter which was forwarded to the GBC and a letter to Jayapataka Swami ([51](#), [52](#)). Ameyatma dasa makes many important points)

MRdd says we are!? Since when is MRdd an organizer of COM? How can she render such a judgement that there are no more issues to discuss? "We are" only reinforces the conclusion that this action is being taken so continued attacks on Topical Discussion and other conferences can be carried on with impunity. We have never seen a more deliberate attack on the authority of the GBC. An asset of ISKCON and the BBT has been arrogantly stolen from under the noses of the GBC while they mull over what is an offense and proper protocols to react to it.

So there is no longer a need to discuss! The devotees responsible for making so many

disrespectful comments about Srila Prabhupada have now hijacked the BBT email system which has been paid for by the distribution of Srila Prabhupada's books and they don't need to discuss. Life can't get stranger. The GBC Executive Chairman declares he is ineffective and a BBT Trustee pulls a coup d'etat after making statements that he is ready to follow the direction of the GBC. We can only pray that this is not the end of the matter and that the full membership of BBT Trustees will take affirmative action. But who can tell based upon past history? At a minimum, Brahma Muhurta dasa and Raktambara dasa should be relieved of their duties.

So now that you have been made aware of some of the going-ons, we request that you become pro-active. On Oct. 29/99 Dvaipayana Vyasa and Madhusudani Radha d.d. made an appeal after learning of an effort to inform GBC members and leading devotees about the attacks on Srila Prabhupada as outlined above. Their statement was:

"Subject: Attempts to silence members of Topical Discussions

Please support these efforts and support all those who participate in this - they will need it. You may elect to show your support in private letters or phone calls, either to devotees with whom you agree, or to leaders with whom you have good relationships. You may of course also chose to make your support in more public way. This is a crucial time for our society and there are many external forces trying to tear us apart. Please help us to ensure that we can have supportive and loving dealings within our society and allow all of our voices to be heard. We believe that this is the only way in which we can remain strong and survive."

Unfortunately for them, the letter writing campaign did not have the desired effect because few GBC members were swayed by their arguments. With few options left, they took the medium private. This is certainly a desperate action from a group who call for "loving dealings" and to have all of our voices heard?" They speak about "many external forces trying to tear us apart." We are curious to know if this comment, coupled with their action of going private with COM and statement that they will be friendly with the GBC until further notice, is identifying the GBC as part of those external forces. By this action, it seems that the offensive against Srila Prabhupada has expanded their target to include the GBC.

So we are going take a page from their book even though it didn't work for them. We request that every devotee who receives this email forward it onto their friends, Temple Presidents, Regional Secretaries, GBC members and congregational members. There is a fire in Srila Prabhupada's house that has to be put out. This issue must be publicized in order to encourage the GBC and BBT Trustees to fulfill their mandate. Neophyte devotees are attempting to bring the Krsna conscious philosophy down to their level of understanding and attachment. It cannot be allowed to happen. We must stand up and vigorously show our love and commitment to Srila Prabhupada. Nothing less is acceptable. Let us join together to put out this fire. It is what Srila Prabhupada would want us to do.

Your servant

Vyapaka dasa

Below please find for your convenience the email addresses of leaders in ISKCON. Please make your voice heard in defence of of the honor and transcendental position of our beloved Founder Acarya Srila Prabhupada. Just think, where would you be if it were not for him?

GBC Executive Committee

Bir.krishna.das.goswami@com..bbt.se
Madhu.Sevita.ACBSP@com.bbt.se
Gopal.Krsna.Goswami@com.bbt.se

Guru of Madhusudhani Radha devi dasi:

Jayapataka.Swami@com.bbt.se

GBC and Senior devotees:

AC.Bhaktivaibhava.Swami@com.bbt.se
Badrinarayan.ACBSP@com.bbt.se
Bhakti.Caitanya.Swami@com.bbt.se
Bhakti.Caru.Swami@com.bbt.se
Bhakti.Raghava.Swami@com.bbt.se
Bhakti-bhusana.Swami@com.bbt.se
Bhakti-tirtha.Swami@com.bbt.se
Bhaktisvarupa.Damodara.Swami@com.bbt.se
Bhurijana.ACBSP@com.bbt.se
Giridhari.Swami@com.bbt.se
Giriraja.Swami@com.bbt.se
Govinda.Swami@com.bbt.se
Guru.Prasad.Swami@com.bbt.se
Guru-sakti.HKS@com.bbt.se
Hari.Sauri.ACBSP@com.bbt.se
Harivilas.ACBSP@com.bbt.se
Jayadvaita.Swami@com.bbt.se
Kavicandra.Swami@com.bbt.se
Lokanath.Swami@com.bbt.se
Naveen.Krishna.ACBSP@com.bbt.se
Niranjana.Swami@com.bbt.se
Paramgati.Swami@com.bbt.se
Prabhavisnu.Swami@com.bbt.se
Prahlanananda.Swami@com.bbt.se
Prithu.ACBSP@com.bbt.se
Radhanatha.Swami@com.bbt.se
Ramai.Swami@com.bbt.se
Ravindra.Svarupa.ACBSP@com.bbt.se
Rohini.Suta.aCBSP@com.bbt.se
Romapada.Swami@com.bbt.se
Sesa.ACBSP@com.bbt.se

Tridandi Sannyasis

Atmanivedana.Swami@com.bbt.se
Bhakti.Purusottama.Swami@com.bbt.se
Bhakti.Vikasa.Swami@com.bbt.se
Bhaktimarga.Swami@com.bbt.se
Bhanu.Swami@com.bbt.se
bhaktisid.swami@ibm.net
BVV.Narasimha.Swami@com.bbt.se
Danavir.das.Goswami@com.bbt.se
Devamrita.Swami@com.bbt.se
Ganapati.swami@com.bbt.se
Gunagrahi.das.Goswami@com.bbt.se
Hanumatpresaka.Swami@com.bbt.se
Indradyumna.swami@com.bbt.se
Kadamba.Kanana.Swami@com.bbt.se
Kesava.Swami@com.bbt.se
Mahavishnu.Swami@com.bbt.se
Nityodita.Swami@com.bbt.se
Rasananda.Swami@com.bbt.se
Rtadhvaja.Swami@com.bbt.se
Smita.Krsna.Swami@com.bbt.se
Umapati.Swami@com.bbt.se
Veda.Vyasa.Priya.Swami@com.bbt.se

BBT Trustees (Responsible for COM)

Brahma.Muhurta.Das@com.bbt.se
Jayadvaita.Swami@com.bbt.se
Madhu.Sevita.ACBSP@bbt.se.com
Naresvara.ACBSP@com.bbt.se
Svavas.ACBSP@com.bbt.se

COM sysops

Raktambara@com.bbt.se
Mukhya@com.bbt.se

Sivarama.Swami@com.bbt.se
Sridhar.Swami@com.bbt.se
Suhotra.Swami@com.bbt.se
Tamal.Krishna.Goswami@com.bbt.se
Trivikrama.Swami@com.bbt.se
Vaidyanatha.HKS@com.bbt.se
Virabahu.ACBSP@com.bbt.se

Examples of Widespread Questioning or Criticism of Srila Prabhupada

[1.](#) Vaisnava Advanced Studies (VAST): SUMMARY OF TEXTS

[2.](#) Mother Madhusudani Radha suggesting the footnoting of Srila Prabhupada's books (May 3, 1999)

[3.](#) Mother Dhyanakunda d.d.'s comments on Topical Discussions conference.

[4.](#) Letter from Madhusudani Radha d.d. (Dr. Ekstrand) to Mahananda dasa re. her decision to obstruct him from the Topical Discussion conference.

[5.](#) Email #2 from Mother Madhusudani Radha d.d. to Mahananda dasa re. participation in Topical Discussion conf.

[6.](#) Mother Madhusudani Radha d.d. states that 80% of patients at sex clinics are vaisnavas engaging in activities of sodomy, drunkenness, etc.

[7.](#) Letters to Vyapaka dasa from Madhusudani Radha d.d. stating reasons for refusing his admission to Topical Discussion conference.

[8.](#) Harsi dasa commenting on Srila Prabhupada's teaching regarding women attending varnasrama college.

[9.](#) Harsi dasa writing again about his opinions towards aspects of Srila Prabhupada's teachings regarding varnasrama.

[10.](#) Dvaipayana dasa co-coordinator of Topical Discussions conference) commenting on postings from Mother Dhyanakunda d.d.

[11.](#) Mother Hare Krsna dasi postulating Srila Prabhupada being susceptible to errors on the "material" platform.

[12.](#) Email protesting that the criticism of Srila Prabhupada has spread to other conferences.

[13.](#) Mother Madhusudani Radha suggesting that a study be conducted to see if Srila Prabhupada was in some manner responsible for the child abuse experienced in the movement.

[14.](#) BBT policy re. COM conferences

[15.](#) Applicable GBC Laws in regards to offending Srila Prabhupada, the founder/acarya of ISKCON.

Highlights From a Discussion between assorted GBC members, Sannyasis and Prominent Devotees

(many available postings have been omitted. The following quotes have been chosen because they are representative of both the gist and various turns in the discussion).

[16.](#) Letter from H.H. Sivarama Swami beginning debate in regards to offences to Srila Prabhupada.

[17.](#) Hari Sauri Prabhu agreeing with Shyamasundara's concerns.

[18.](#) Brahma Muhurta dasa, NE BBT Trustee, describing the purpose behind COM.

[19.](#) Brahma Muhurta Dasa agreeing to the closing of COM conferences and requesting feedback from COM sysop, Raktambara dasa.

[20.](#) Hari Sauri dasa commenting that closing all conferences may be too radical.

[21.](#) Bir Krsna Gos. protesting the fact that ISKCON-BBT are paying for conferences criticizing Srila Prabhupada.

[22.](#) Jayapataka Swami agrees that COM should be monitored and moderated.

[23.](#) GBC member evicted from COM conference for standing up for Srila Prabhupada and complaining about COM-logic.

[24.](#) Bhakti Caru Swami suggesting expulsion as punishment for blasphemy of Srila Prabhupada.

[25.](#) Bhakti Caru Swami questioning Jayapataka Swami on his efforts to control his disciple Madhusudani Radha d.d.

[26.](#) GBC member, Prithu dasa, calls for specific ISKCON laws to be enforced and censure of Madhusudani Radha d.d.

[27.](#) Bir Krsna das Goswami chimes in chorus with Bhakti Caru Swami to Jayapataka Swami to control Mrdd.

[28.](#) Bhakti Caru Swami encourages Bir Krsna Swami to affirm that Srila Prabhupada's teachings are the basis of ISKCON and that strong action should be taken to ensure that this continues.

[29a.](#) Sivarama Swami responds to Bir Krsna dasa Goswami's request for concrete

suggestions.

29b. Bir Krsna Goswami responds to the widespread calls for action.

30. Jayapataka Swami defends MRdd and requests a policy be formulated on proper protocols for COM.

31. Bhakti Brnga Govinda Swami makes strong suggestions to Bir Krishna dasa Goswami on appropriate action.

32. Bhakti Vikasa Swami echoes sentiments just expressed by Bhakti Brnga Govinda Swami.

33. Jayapataka Swami reaffirms his earlier call for non-expulsion and establishment of protocols.

34. MRdd defends VAST discussions.

35. Prithu dasa responds to Jayapataka Swami's call for tolerance.

36. Jayapataka Swami requests a definition on what actually is blasphemy; what is an impropriety and what is an offense.

37. Bhakti Vikasa Swami responds to Mrdd's claim regarding Srila Prabhupada and child abuse.

38. Syamasundara dasa (astrologer) clarifies the history and specifics of discussion to Jayapataka Swami (this letter was to JPS 5 times but never responded to).

39. Sivarama Swami expressing frustration at the lack of practical action in regards to offensive statements against Srila Prabhupada on COM.

[40.](#) Bhakti Vikasa Swami defines proper mood in which to study Srila Prabhupada's teachings.

[41.](#) Jayapataka Swami continues to defend MRdd.

[42.](#) Chairman of GBC Executive Committee not allowed to close COM conferences.

[43.](#) Prithu dasa emphasizes that there will be a price to pay for tolerating such blasphemous remarks. We are increasingly being controlled by software.

[44.](#) Hari Sauri dasa urges to stop these messages which are contaminating many devotees.

[45.](#) Prithu dasa emphasizes need for specific action and quotes Raktambara dasa (COM Sysop) that the BBT is in charge of COM.

[46.](#) Jayapataka Swami opines that Mrdd. isn't the problem and suggests specific action to improve COM situation.

[47.](#) Sivarama Swami resigns from GBC Body.

[48.](#) Bhakti Caru Swami resigns from GBC Body.

[49.](#) Excerpts from an announcement by Raktambara dasa (COM Sysop) that COM has now been leased from the BBT and is no longer under the control of the GBC.

[50.](#) Ameyatma dasa responding (and quoting) to an email from Madhusudani Radha d.d.

[51.](#) Ameyatma dasa addresses Jayapataka Swami's points.

52. Ameyatma dasa writes to GBC regarding latest revelation by Mrdd that COM has been taken out of the control of the BBT and GBC.

53. Nayana-ranjana das refutes some of the comments made by Dhyanakunda d.d. on Topical Discussion conference.

54. Topical Discussion Moderators call for letter writing campaign to allow discussion of "untouchable subjects"

55. Hari Sauri Prabhu points out that anyone who has seen the texts put out Madhusudhani Radhe dd can see that she is faithless.

EXAMPLES OF WIDESPREAD QUESTIONING/CRITICISM OF SRILA PRABHUPADA

1. Vaisnava Advanced Studies (VAST) – excerpts from VNN posting by Jivan Mukta dasa.

For further reference see [VAST PC Run Amok?](#)

SUMMARY OF TEXTS

TEXT #1: Madhusudani Radha devi dasi (JPS)

Date: Tue, 27 Jan 98 12:22 -0700
From: "COM: Madhusudani Radha JPS"

This is obviously a very sensitive area, so I will try to be careful as I further clarify my thoughts. Basically, it seems like we have three options in terms of how to interpret Srila Prabhupada's statements about women's intelligence:

1. Prabhupada meant spiritual intelligence

I don't think any of us on this conference are going to entertain this possibility seriously, as spiritually, we are all equal, i.e. we are neither men nor women.

2. Prabhupada meant material intelligence

If this is the case, it could be something he picked up from his college professors or from the culture where he grew up.

3. Prabhupada meant some other kind of intelligence

If Prabhupada was not referring to spiritual intelligence, or to what we typically think of as material intelligence (IQ), then I can not comment on whether he was right or wrong.

However, if you really think this is the case, I have one suggestion: Change the books. The way they are currently written will be interpreted by the majority of people to mean option #2 above. If this is not what we want them to say, we need to indicate that very clearly. Otherwise we will lose many, many souls who will have been unable to

see beyond that miscommunication.

Ys, Madhusudani

TEXT #2: Madhusudani Radha devi dasi (JPS)

Date: Tue, 3 Feb 98 08:36 -0700

From: "COM: Madhusudani Radha JPS"<MADHUSUDANI.RADHA.JPS@COM.BBT.SE

To: "COM: VAST (Vaishnava Advanced Studies)"<VAST@COM.BBT.SE

Subject: Women speaking for themselves

Personally, I do object to both restrictions.

1. Restricting women's service opportunities clearly violates Srila Prabhupada's desires.
2. I also object to the characterization of women as less materially intelligent, based both on psychology research and on personal experience.

I know that, materially speaking, I am more intelligent than many men in our society.

Ys, Madhusudani

TEXT #3: Prithu das (ACBSP)

From: Prithu (das) ACBSP

Date: 19-May-98 12:26 -0700

To: Hariballabha (dd) HKS (Berlin - D) [4611] (received: 19-May-98 21:50 +0100)

Cc: Arjuna (das) HKS (Munich - D) [5888] (received: 20-May-98 07:42 +0200),

Jyotirmayi dd<JYOTIRMAYI@WANADOO.FR (sent: 19-May-98 21:32 +0200),

VAST (Vaishnava Advanced Studies) [2450]

For: IWC (Internat. Women's Conference)

Subject: re - I did not say that

What I said is clear if you read my letter above

As far as Srila Prabhupada's statements in Folio anyway, is it by now not more honest for you to say that you want to distance yourself from what SP says rather than taking it out on me? It is only the next step.

Of course I am telling you it's a Pandora's box. Because what is next and where where do you want to end? I certainly could never do so. For me what Srila Prabhupada says is my life and soul and all I have.

Hence I definitely would say anything SP said and without prejudice, because I think it's an offence to the spiritual master to keep an opinion over and above one's spiritual masters opinion.

And I think it's amazing that Mother Madhusudani Radhe suggests to me, quote: "If you want to distance yourself from what Amavasya quoted you as saying, or from Prabhupada's statements about the reasons for the 95-100 female to male ratio in India, I would encourage you to do so on both VAST and IWC."

I have done as far as Amavasya dd's presentation. As far as distancing myself from what Srila Prabhupada says, that I cannot do. Sorry, there is a point when I just must bail out.

And for me its clear we are getting here into a very dangerous position.

Yspda

TEXT #4: Bankabihari devi dasi (HDG)

Date: Sun, 1 Feb 98 19:13 -0800

From: "COM: Bankabihari HDG"<BANKABIHARI.HDG@COM.BBT.SE
Reply-To: Bankabihari.HDG@com.bbt.se, VAST@com.bbt.se
To: "COM: VAST (Vaishnava Advanced Studies)"<VAST@COM.BBT.SE

Satyaraja Prabhu:

>Things seem to go downhill for women around the time of Manu (when was >this

.I gather that at a particular point in time and space *dharma* -- in the sense of world-view and life-style codes, both for humanity at large and for specific classes of people -- was an issue. If dharma is not an issue, then there is no need for dharma-sastra

If that is shown to be the case, then it would be interesting to find out, as much as possible, what the position of women was in sastras that are older than the dharma-sastras

We would have to try to determine specifically what society, and social issues, the Manu-smṛiti was responding to.

I think several devotees suggested that these inquiries may lead to editorial efforts -- to publish Prabhupada's books with a subcommentary,,,

y.s. bdd

TEXT #5: Advaita dasa (HDG)

Date: Mon, 16 Feb 98 07:24 -0500
From: "Edwin B." <-->

Amoghaji,

In one sense this issue is going round and round and perhaps not going anywhere to the satisfaction of everyone. Perhaps that is good; I hope this women's issue is becoming the next crisis in ISKCON, of the magnitude of the guru crisis of the 80's. We men, of course, can get sick of this conversation, or fudge things over, and walk away back to our privileged positions as men (leaving the women get stuck with their lot).

I guess the problem I have in understanding passages like the one you quoted (apart from the fact that these are the very passages that make me cringe about giving Prabhupada's books to the types of people with whom I am interacting), is that they just plain don't correspond to any kind of reality that I have experienced either in ISKCON or out.

YS APD

TEXT #6: Advaita dasa (HDG)

From: Edwin B. <-->
Subject: Re: Feminism, etc

Dear Prabhus,

Even if one were to argue that the female material form is more attractive (hence like fire), one is not then entitled to infer that the psychological state of women is somehow more lusty. At least in the absence of textual evidence. But some of us have agreed that this statement refers to sexual stamina, not inherent lustiness as ISKCON has historically interpreted it. So perhaps we need to broadcast this position within our respective spheres of influence in an endeavor to change the aspects of our KC culture that are blatantly sexist. But more damaging, I think, has been the idea that women are less intelligent. (Does anyone have any explicit textual sources that state this)?

I think we also need to examine what Prabhupada meant by this. Prabhupada's sources are either scriptural, or from some material source. If there are explicit scriptural verses that Prabhupada quotes, we need to look at the context of the verses and also at the exact ,Sanskrit word used in the primary source which Prabhupada (or his

editors) translated as 'less intelligent'. Regarding material sources, these need to be examined to see if they are just plain wrong

We need to discuss what Prabhupada was learning as a young man in, say, Scottish Churches College at the beginning of this century

If Prabhupada picked up information from such sources which he later used in preaching, then we have to be prepared to correct it and contextualize it on behalf of our spiritual master

YS APD

TEXT #7: Advaita dasa (HDG)

From: Edwin B. (Advaita)
Subject: Re: Feminism, etc
[Text 1054625 from COM]

What are you going to tell your students when they read these things in Prabhupada's books? I had all my students read one of Prabhupada's little books and they hated the sexist statements (and sexist atmosphere in the temple) while appreciating much else

TEXT #8: Amoghalila dasa

Date: Tue, 27 Jan 1998 07:42:29 -0800
From: "Allan M. Keislar" <KEISLAR@UCLINK2.BERKELEY.EDU>

Advaita Prabhu, I remember the same thing happening distributing Bhagavad-gitas on the street a year or two ago. After a brief discussion which was very enlivening to both of us, a brilliant young woman took a random look at the book (I can't remember the reference now, but I recall that it was something about women being of lower class or intelligence) and, with a not unpleasant but rather sad and also condescending laugh, handed the book back to me and quickly walked off as I tried helplessly to get her to reconsider. What are we going to do? I don't know, but I agree with you that we have to do something, and I think you are on the right track.

Amoghalila das

TEXT #9: Advaita dasa (HDG)

Date: Tue, 27 Jan 98 06:36 -0500

From: Edwin B. <-->

I propose that this conversation can go no further until we discuss FACTS. I propose we consider as facts two types of pramanas: Sabda--explicit shastric statements regarding women's intelligence vis-a-vis men's; and pratyaksha--comprehensive scientific studies accepted by most members in the scientific community (which are deemed acceptable by a majority of reasonable feminist intellectuals).

YS APD

Complete Texts

TEXT #1: Madhusudani Radha devi dasi (JPS)

[Madhusudani Radha devi dasi founded, financially supports and is an editor for CHAKRA. She is a very outspoken proponent of feminism and is apparently supported in her efforts by her initiating guru, Jayapataka Swami. In a future posting, we will also see how she is unable to totally absolve Srila Prabhupada from his alleged criminal responsibility with respect to the ISKCON gurukula child abuse.]

Date: Tue, 27 Jan 98 12:22 -0700

From: "COM: Madhusudani Radha JPS" To: "COM: VAST (Vaishnava Advanced Studies)"

Subject: Women and intelligence [Text 1067751 from COM]

This is obviously a very sensitive area, so I will try to be careful as I further clarify my thoughts. Basically, it seems like we have three options in terms of how to interpret Srila Prabhupada's statements about women's intelligence:

1. Prabhupada meant spiritual intelligence

I don't think any of us on this conference are going to entertain this possibility seriously, as spiritually, we are all equal, i.e. we are neither men nor women.

2. Prabhupada meant material intelligence

If this is the case, it could be something he picked up from his college professors or from the culture where he grew up. We know from other writings that Prabhupada was more flexible on these topics and did not present himself as an expert at all times. He even suggested to disciples that they get advice elsewhere (as in when disciples asked him for health advice and he told them not to ask him but to consult a doctor). Since you gave some latitude in your text, Maharaja, regarding people who have professional competency, I'm going to take you up on this.

Measurement of material intelligence is the subject matter of clinical and educational psychologists. We spend many years in graduate school learning about different tests, the administration, cultural factors, scoring, interpretation and various controversies. I have probably administered, scored and interpreted at least a hundred intelligence tests during graduate school and following receipt of my PhD in clinical psychology, so this is not just based on my personal views.

The main problem everyone runs into when discussing population differences in intelligence is that there may be differences in means between groups, but the distributions overlap to such a great extent that any such differences are often meaningless. The issue of differences has, as you probably already know, been a very hot topic in the area of race and ethnic differences. Many biological, genetic and cultural differences have been provided to explain why Asians typically score higher than Whites, who in turn score higher than Latinos and African-Americans.

Have the negative statements in the SB about African Americans ever come up in your academic environments? When it comes to gender differences on IQ tests, they are really minute and can not be used to demonstrate the superiority of either gender. We can not even use the test to show that the most intelligent man has a higher IQ than the most intelligent woman. In fact, the person who has the highest recorded score in the world is currently a woman. We can of course debate forever what "real" intelligence is, its components, and the relatively recent concept of emotional intelligence, but I would caution against such a direction.

What seems to have started this discussion appears to be the fact that it says that women are less intelligent in Prabhupada's books. Most people who react unfavorably to these statements are going to interpret this as meaning that he is saying that women have a lower IQ. That's why they turn away. This brings us to the third option:

3. Prabhupada meant some other kind of intelligence

If Prabhupada was not referring to spiritual intelligence, or to what we typically think of as material intelligence (IQ), then I can not comment on whether he was right or wrong.

However, if you really think this is the case, I have one suggestion: Change the books. The way they are currently written will be interpreted by the majority of people to mean option #2 above. If this is not what we want them to say, we need to indicate that very clearly. Otherwise we will lose many, many souls who will have been unable to see beyond that miscommunication.

Ys, Madhusudani

[In this text, Madhusudani Radha devi dasi summarizes her appeal for the book changes in this way:

Intelligence could be of three kinds:

1. spiritual intelligence
2. material intelligence
3. some other type of intelligence

If in saying that women were less intelligent, Prabhupada was not referring to material or spiritual intelligence, i.e. if he was referring to "some other type of intelligence" then she cannot say whether he was right or wrong until the "scholars" define what that other type of intelligence actually is. If the scholars actually deem that Prabhupada was referring to some other type of intelligence i.e. he was not referring to material or spiritual intelligence, then she recommends that we CHANGE THE BOOKS. Why? Because as they stand, the statements are understood by the majority of people to mean that women are "materially" less intelligent. This "miscommunication" of Prabhupada's intention is causing ISKCON to lose many souls who would have otherwise joined.]

TEXT #2: Madhusudani Radha devi dasi (JPS)

Date: Tue, 3 Feb 98 08:36 -0700

From: "COM: Madhusudani Radha JPS"<MADHUSUDANI.RADHA.JPS@COM.BBT.SE

To: "COM: VAST (Vaishnava Advanced Studies)"<VAST@COM.BBT.SE

Subject: Women speaking for themselves

Personally, I do object to both restrictions.

3. Restricting women's service opportunities clearly violates Srila Prabhupada's desires.
4. I also object to the characterization of women as less materially intelligent, based both on psychology research and on personal experience.

I know that, materially speaking, I am more intelligent than many men in our society.

Ys,

Madhusudani

[In the previous text Madhusudani Radha devi dasi rejected the definition of "less intelligence" as spiritual intelligence or material intelligence. She now reinforces her point by stating that not only would defining "less-intelligent" as material intelligence contradict psychological research, but it would contradict her own personal experience which is that she is "more intelligent than many men in our society." As such it is her conclusion that Prabhupada meant some other type of intelligence and hence his books should be changed to reflect that other intelligence.]

TEXT #3: Prithu dasa (ACBSP)

[A member of the GBC and an ISKCON initiating guru. Hariballabha devi dasi is a member of the ISKCON Women's Ministry and the Mataji Council in Germany.]

From: Prithu (das) ACBSP

Date: 19-May-98 12:26 -0700

To: Hariballabha (dd) HKS (Berlin - D) [4611] (received: 19-May-98 21:50 +0100)

Cc: Arjuna (das) HKS (Munich - D) [5888] (received: 20-May-98 07:42 +0200),

Jyotirmayi dd<JYOTIRMAYI@WANADOO.FR (sent: 19-May-98 21:32 +0200),

VAST (Vaishnava Advanced Studies) [2450]

For: IWC (Internat. Women's Conference)

Subject: re - I did not say that

What I said is clear if you read my letter above. Which does not conflict with what Arjuna thinks and says he heard. Has nothing to do with couples. The onus is always on the men, women are innocent. But if men are weak, Srila Prabhupada did say female birth is favored. He calls it a defect in Dananjaya's letter.

[The entire controversy here arose from Prithu dasa quoting statements wherein Prabhupada expressed concern and spoke disparagingly about female births. The quotes form part of this text.]

As far as Srila Prabhupada's statements in Folio anyway, is it by now not more honest for you to say that you want to distance yourself from what SP says rather than taking it out on me? It is only the next step.

[This is addressed to Hariballabha devi dasi (HKS) who wanted him to retract his statements. Prithu das advises her to be truthful and instead of venting her wrath upon him -- Prabhupada's messenger -- she should simply admit her inability to accept Srila Prabhupada's authority on these matters.]

Of course I am telling you it's a Pandora's box. Because what is next and where do you want to end? I certainly could never do so. For me what Srila Prabhupada says is my life and soul and all I have.

[Prithu dasa asks, "what is next"? We will see that the objective is to purge Prabhupada's teaching of these sexist comments.]

Hence I definitely would say anything SP said and without prejudice, because I think it's an offence to the spiritual master to keep an opinion over and above one's spiritual masters opinion.

And I think it's amazing that Mother Madhusudani Radhe suggests to me, quote: "If you want to distance yourself from what Amavasya quoted you as saying, or from Prabhupada's statements about the reasons for the 95-100 female to male ratio in India, I would encourage you to do so on both VAST and IWC."

[Herein Madhusudani Radha devi dasi encourages Prithu dasa to publicly distance himself from the teachings of his spiritual master, Srila Prabhupada.]

I have done as far as Amavasya dd's presentation. As far as distancing myself from what Srila Prabhupada says, that I cannot do. Sorry, there is a point when I just must bail out.

And for me its clear we are getting here into a very dangerous position.

Yspda

Here are Prabhupada's quotes from Folio. Please excuse the length:

Prabhupada: And the more the man will become attached to woman, the woman population will increase. It is psychological. The whole world is increasing woman population. So therefore there is desire, especially in (indistinct).

Devotee: How is that?

Prabhupada: The same principle-if milk is available in the market, what is the use of keeping a cow?

Devotee: How does that result in more women?

Prabhupada: When you have more sex, then you have no power to beget a male child. When the man is less powerful, a girl is born. When the man is powerful, a boy is born. That is Vedic system. In our country, in (indistinct), there are fewer woman because there the men are very stout and strong. When there is discharge, if the man's discharge is larger, then there is a male child; if the woman's discharge is larger, then there is a female child. So when women will be very easily available, the men will be weak. So what will he beget? He will beget female child, because he has lost his power. Sometimes he becomes impotent. So many desertions. If you don't restrict sex life, there will be so many desertions. And that is happening-impotency, no marriage, woman population more. But they did not know how things are happening, how human psychology can be controlled. The perfect system is the Vedic system.

(Discussion with Syamasundara on Sigismund Freud)

Radhavallabha: Srila Prabhupada, in one BTG article, you listed... Prabhupada: Eh?

Radhavallabha: In one BTG article, you described increase in women population as a natural disaster.

Prabhupada: Yes.

Radhavallabha: So when one woman read this article, she became very angry. She came back and was very angry.

Prabhupada: She may be angry. She is woman and man. Actually this is physiological. If a man is too much addicted to sex life, he'll become impotent, and if he begets child, it will be a girl. With no potency to give birth to a male child.... That requires potency.

Hamsaduta: When we were going around in London making life members, I noticed that in so many families, all the children are girls. Prabhupada: Yes. The whole world is full of girls, girl children. Why? There is no potency. Potency finished. Or impotent. And if you keep one boy brahmachari, no sex life, and get him married, the first child must be a boy, must be, without any doubt.

Lokanatha: That means, then, woman is more potent than... Prabhupada: Yes, yes. Yes. The Ayur-vedic formula is that when there is discharge, woman's discharge, more, means girl, and man's discharge, more, means boy. This is physiological.

Ramesvara: The women argue that they are stronger than the men. Prabhupada: Yes. You are stronger than the man, that when there is fight, the man goes; you do not go. You are so strong. You are simply ravished in the absence of your husband. That's all.

(Morning walk - March 19/76 Mayapur)

N.B. I am also in receipt of your letters dated October 20 & 21, 1975. I note that your wife and Visalaini both gave birth to baby girls. That is the defect. I want male children but you have no stamina for it. I expected from Visalaini by her belly that it would be a boy. Anyway, never mind. The name Brijlata is nice. Why do the majority of my married disciples give birth to girls?

(Letter to: Dhananjaya: Bombay 9 November, 1975)

TEXT #4: Bankabihari devi dasi (HDG)

[Bankabihari devi dasi is a PhD sanskrit candidate at Berkeley. Satyaraja dasa is a disciple of Srila Prabhupada and the author of various books on Vaisnavism.]

Date: Sun, 1 Feb 98 19:13 -0800

From: "COM: Bankabihari HDG"<BANKABIHARI.HDG@COM.BBT.SE

Reply-To: Bankabihari.HDG@com.bbt.se, VAST@com.bbt.se

To: "COM: VAST (Vaishnava Advanced Studies)"<VAST@COM.BBT.SE

Satyaraja Prabhu:

>Things seem to go downhill for women around the time of Manu (when was >this?), or, according to some, around the time of the Muslim influence. After >this, for reasons we need to explore, texts emphasizing the ritual impurity of >women came to the fore, and marriage (vivaaha), service to the husband >(patisevaa), and housework (grhaarthas) became the almost exclusive services that women could perform. Women were depicted as morally weak and, in some ways, >the greatest detriment to man. Early texts that emphasize their physical and >mental frailties were quoted (paraphrased?) and the fact that they should never >be independent, both for their own good and for that of their men--indeed, for >society as a whole-- became the thing most known about women.

[Satyaraja dasa explains how abuse against women started during the time of Manu (I really can't understand when that would be since Manu was the first created human being). According to Satyaraja dasa, such ritualistic abuse is characterized by an emphasis that a woman's duty is to serve her husband and manage the household.]

One thing I'd like to add re. the historical inquiry. From the mere existence of *dharma-sastras* (of which the Manu-smṛti is one example) I gather that at a particular point in time and space *dharma* -- in the sense of world-view and life-style codes, both for humanity at large and for specific classes of people -- was an issue. If dharma is not an issue, then there is no need for dharma-sastra. Now, if the dharma sastras are not the oldest kind of Skt. literature there is, there must have been a time when everybody knew what their position in society was and how to behave properly according to a culture that was not being contested or challenged in any way.

[Bankabihari devi dasi is now seeking to understand the social mores of a "pre-dharma" society (whatever that may be) in order to comprehensively evaluate the plight of women during the "dharma" periods of human history.]

If that is shown to be the case, then it would be interesting to find out, as much as possible, what the position of women was in sastras that are older than the dharma-sastras. Which leads us to the issue of relative chronology. I don't know whether anyone already has a relative chronology chart of all the Skt. texts that Prabhupada quoted or at least respected. Besides, to correlate a text and its specific society/culture/power structure we will need to have some idea of the text's absolute chronology as well. We would have to try to determine specifically what society, and social issues, the Manu-smṛti was responding to.

[Bankabihari devi dasi's point seems to be that if the social issue to which Manu samhita was responding was identified, then the subjugation of women inherent in Manu's moral codes could be eliminated, especially in a transcendental society like ISKCON.]

I think several devotees suggested that these inquiries may lead to editorial efforts -- to publish Prabhupada's books with a subcommentary or other books inspired in Prabhupada's books -- as well as to varnasrama planning and implementation.

y.s. bdd

[Bankabihari devi dasi endorses editing Prabhupada's books.]

TEXT #5: Advaita dasa (HDG)

[Edwin B.]

Date: Mon, 16 Feb 98 07:24 -0500

From: "Edwin B." <-->

To: keislar@uclink2.berkeley.edu

To: "COM: VAST (Vaishnava Advanced Studies)"<VAST@COM.BBT.SE

Subject: Women and bodily identification.

Amoghaji,

In one sense this issue is going round and round and perhaps not going anywhere to the satisfaction of everyone. Perhaps that is good; I hope this women's issue is becoming the next crisis in ISKCON, of the magnitude of the guru crisis of the 80's. We men, of course, can get sick of this conversation, or fudge things over, and walk away back to our privileged positions as men (leaving the women get stuck with their lot).

I guess the problem I have in understanding passages like the one you quoted (apart from the fact that these are the very passages that make me cringe about giving Prabhupada's books to the types of people with whom I am interacting), is that they just plain don't correspond to any kind of reality that I have experienced either in ISKCON or out.

YS APD

[Advaita dasa feels so embarrassed about Prabhupada's statements that he "cringes" at the thought of giving someone His Divine Grace's books.]

TEXT #6: Advaita dasa (HDG)

From: Edwin B. <-->
Subject: Re: Feminism, etc

Dear Prabhus,

I agree with Amogha that it would be helpful to find accurate references to this ninefold lustiness. And not just helpful, but imperative since it seems that our misappropriations of such statements has created a culture wherein our women have been falsely branded and stereotyped.

[Advaita dasa feels it an injustice that women have been branded and stereotyped by Prabhupada and sastra as being nine times lustier than men. He appeals for references that contradict or neutralize this sexist statement.]

Men as butter and women as fire, it seems to me, again suggests that men are the weaker element, ie. more lusty and prone to lose their composure in the association of the opposite sex. Even if one were to argue that the female material form is more attractive (hence like fire), one is not then entitled to infer that the psychological state of women is somehow more lusty. At least in the absence of textual evidence. But some of us have agreed that this statement refers to sexual stamina, not inherent lustiness as ISKCON has historically interpreted it. So perhaps we need to broadcast this position within our respective spheres of influence in an endeavour to change the aspects of our KC culture that are blatantly sexist. But more damaging, I think, has been the idea that women are less intelligent. Does anyone have any explicit textual sources that state this (i.e. not from Prabhupada's purports, but from authorized Sanskrit scriptures)?

[Advaita dasa seeks evidence regarding women's intelligence vis a vis men from an "authorized scriptural source"; not from Srila Prabhupada's books. Prabhupada's books, evidently, don't fall within the category of authorized scripture.]

I think we also need to examine what Prabhupada meant by this. Prabhupada's sources are either scriptural, or from some material source. If there are explicit scriptural verses that Prabhupada quotes, we need to look at the context of the verses and also at the exact Sanskrit word used in the primary source which Prabhupada (or his editors) translated as 'less intelligent'. Regarding material sources, these need to be examined to see if they are just plain wrong.

[Advaita dasa explains that this sexism is possibly due to Prabhupada neglecting to present or explain the proper context of sastric quotes, misdefining Sanskrit words and his application of inaccurate information from material sources.]

Let me give you an example from my own little research to illustrate this possibility. Prabhupada makes three sets of statements regarding the original Indo-Europeans: 1) they came from the Caspian sea, 2) they were the sons of Yayati, 3) they were the sons of Parasurama. Now at least one of these statements is **WRONG** (no's 2 and 3 might be able to coexist, but not with no. 1). Now, I notice that when Prabhupada uses no. 1, he does so in a context that stresses that Europeans are therefore descended from a common Vedic culture which is accordingly their original legacy and that is why they are taking it up. But it is me, the disciple, who has to infer this explanation. It is not explicit. From the point of view of historical accuracy Prabhupada's statement, at face value, is **WRONG** (because if they did come from the Caspian, a whole lot more is going to be wrong). So this is an illustration that Prabhupada sometimes uses material knowledge prevalent at the time just to make a point, but that this information needs to be adjusted, corrected, contextualized, etc because it may be wrong on a literal, scientific or historical level. So, back to the women-are-less-intelligent business. We need to discuss what Prabhupada was learning as a young man in, say, Scottish Churches College at the beginning of this century.

[Advaita dasa now explains how Prabhupada's 'material' education and training could also be a probable cause of his sexist ideas.]

A lot of erroneous sciences like phrenology were doing the rounds. Such sciences determined intelligence or culture by brain size, or the nasal index (Ripley). Women's skull size was considered evidence of their lesser intelligence. If Prabhupada picked up information from such sources which he later used in preaching, then we have to be prepared to correct it and contextualize it on behalf of our spiritual master. Dialectical Spiritualism might be another example of Prabhupada reacting to and using erroneous information in an endeavour to preach. Prabhupada himself was constantly adjusting, modifying and keeping up with the times. This, of course, is related to issues of what is essential and what is time and place.

YS APD

[Advaita dasa explains, in his own creative way, how editing the sexism and accordingly changing Srila Prabhupada's books is the duty and responsibility of a loyal disciple. What are the reasons? One reason is Prabhupada's imperfect understanding on these matters due to his slanted social conditioning and training.]

TEXT #7: Advaita dasa (HDG)

From: Edwin B. (Advaita)
Subject: Re: Feminism, etc
[Text 1054625 from COM]

What are you going to tell your students when they read these things in Prabhupada's books? I had all my students read one of Prabhupada's little books and they hated the sexist statements (and sexist atmosphere in the temple) while appreciating much else.

[Advaita dasa doesn't say that these statements are perceived as sexist but that they are sexist in the most pejorative sense of the word thus directly indicting the author of those books, Srila Prabhupada, and the entire disciplic succession, including Manu.]

Hence this discussion is appropriate for this net (apart from the fact that such issues, in my opinion, have life-and-death consequences for KC in the West).

TEXT #8: Amogha-lila dasa (HDG)

Date: Tue, 27 Jan 1998 07:42:29 -0800
From: "Allan M. Keislar" <KEISLAR@UCLINK2.BERKELEY.EDU>
To: --, VAST@com.bbt.se
Subject: Re: feminine intelligence

[Advaita dasa seems to think that our entire movement needs to be overhauled so that everything that people like his students consider sexist, is expunged from Prabhupada's books.]

>There...now there's an emotional and intuitive intellectual outpouring for

>>you.....this thing has really got me going.... YS APD

Prabhu, I remember the same thing happening distributing Bhagavad-gitas on the street a year or two ago. After a brief discussion which was very enlivening to both of us, a brilliant young woman took a random look at the book (I can't remember the reference now, but I recall that it was something about women being of lower class or intelligence) and, with a not unpleasant but rather sad and also condescending laugh, handed the book back to me and quickly walked off as I tried helplessly to get her to reconsider. What are we going to do? I don't know, but I agree with you that we have to do something, and I think you are on the right track.

Amoghalila das

[Amogha-lila dasa agrees with Advaita dasa that there are some very serious problems with Prabhupada's books all stemming from his sexist statements. He also feels that editing the books is "the right track" to follow.]

TEXT #9: Advaita dasa (HDG)

Date: Tue, 27 Jan 98 06:36 -0500
From: Edwin B. <-->
To: "COM: VAST (Vaishnava Advanced Studies)" <VAST@COM.BBT.SE>
Subject: Re: FACTS and Womens intelligence.
[Text 1066320 from COM]

Dear Padmanabha Prabhu,

PAMHO AGSP

Thank you for your "feelings" about women's intelligence. While I personally don't have a problem with the possibility that women's emotions are less suppressed than men's (although whether this is inherent or socially constructed is an issue that needs to be discussed) I completely challenge the idea implicit in your posting that this is at the expense of the rational or intellectual faculty (whether we define these latter as per the OED, or in the finger-biting terms outlined by you below). I have already noted what I believe has been the catastrophic results of such discourse--women have been denied access to challenging rational functions such as class-giving and high-powered services in ISKCON causing many intelligent women to leave and creating a sexist devotee culture completely unacceptable to the kind of intelligent people Prabhupada wanted to attract to KC. Remember--intelligent men are going to find this unacceptable, not just women.

[It seems that Advaita dasa considers that current ISKCON members, who accept Prabhupada's "sexist" statements as indicative of fundamental social realities, are less intelligent and below the intellectual pedigree of those in his social circles.]

I propose that this conversation can go no further until we discuss FACTS. I propose we consider as facts two types of pramanas: Sabda--explicit shastric statements regarding women's intelligence vis-a-vis men's; and pratyaksha--comprehensive scientific studies accepted by most members in the scientific community (which are deemed acceptable by a majority of reasonable feminist intellectuals).

YS APD

[Advaita dasa proposes that Prabhupada's sexist statements be verified by sastra and that they be further supported by comprehensive scientific studies accepted not only by members of the scientific community but more importantly, "by a majority of reasonable feminist intellectuals".]

2. Mother Madhusudani Radha suggesting the footnoting of Srila Prabhupada's books:

These comments were preceded by other comments by Mother Hare Krsna dasi suggesting the feasibility of footnoting Srila Prabhupada's books. Unfortunately, this posting is not in our files.

Text COM2286537 -- Varnasrama conference

Date: 03-May-99 10:11 -0800

From: COM: Madhusudani Radha (dd) JPS (Mill Valley - USA)

Re: Jivan Mukta lashes out again.

At 8:11 -0800 5/3/99, COM: Madhava Gosh (das) ACBSP (New Vrindavan - USA) wrote:

>[Text 2286421 from COM]

>

>Well , Madhusudhani, I see your buddy JM is still going after you. I didn't

>have time to plow through the whole thing, but he is hard at you on VNN.

Maybe I should feel flattered that he consider me such a threat that he has to spend so much energy on trying to discredit me. ;-) I saw that he hinted at a "part 2" in which he'd show that I'm unable to absolve Srila Prabhupada of any responsibility for the gurukula abuses. I can save him the trouble. Although the lion's share of the burden obviously rests with the abusers themselves, I do think that *everyone* who was in ISKCON at the time shoulders some of the blame. So there, Jivanmukta (if someone leaks this to you), I've admitted it. You can take a break from the computer now and go back to helping Sita take care of the family. Didn't you recently have a new baby?

>

>Funny how all the victimization those GHQ types claimed when their texts were

>thrown out in public is conveniently set aside when it is in his perceived

>interest to do the same.

The whole thing is so silly. This was just an academic discussion of possible ways of dealing with language that makes it impossible to use Srila Prabhupada's books for academic preaching. For one thing, they no longer

conform to the professional standards for non-sexist speech. So if Prabhupada *really meant "he or she" when saying he (which is what the convention *used to be*), then that needs to be changed in academic editions. Similarly, some kind of footnotes should be inserted to suggest different ways of understanding what he meant by his "women are less intelligent" statements and the comment about women liking to be raped among others. E.G. is it material intelligence, spiritual intelligence or something completely different? Those are the things scholars will notice and react to.

...So we (on VAST) simply brainstormed ways of possibly dealing with this issue in a way which would allow devotee scholars to use the books in academe. Some alternative were 1) make corrections in the books themselves, if the meanings of words have changed in the past 30 years (e.g. remember when "gay" meant happy? What if our books had said Lord Caitanya was "gay"? Would we have wanted to keep that?), 2) add footnotes to some versions of the books destined for university classes or bookshelves, or 3) just have disciples write their own books for academe (which is what is happening).

3. Mother Dhyanakunda d.d.'s comments on Topical Discussions conference

Date: Tue, 19 Oct 99 11:41 +0200
From: "COM: Dhyanakunda (dd) KKD (NE-BBT, Almvik - S)"
<Dhyanakunda.KKD@bbt.se>
To: Topical Discussions <topical.discussions@bbt.se>
Subject: Contradictions in Prabhupada's words?

Dear Nayan Prabhu,
Please accept my humble obeisances.

>I have read avidly many of your posts here and have found them very
>educational. Your knowledge is splendid on Vaisnava matters and I should
>like to thank you warmly for sharing with us.

Thank you for your kind encouragement. I know little on Vaisnava matters
-- little realization. I know something, but not very much, on Vaisnava
texts, since it used to be my service in the BBT.

>So far as my own reading of Srila Prabhupada's books is concerned over
>many years now, I have never *EVER* found him to contradict himself! He
>might have given what to us would seem to be opposing instructions to
>different persons at times, but that was according to the recipient, the
>time and the circumstance. With a little intelligence, it is always easy
>to judge what he meant in such instances and to understand it in the
>right context.

I wondered whether I should post here examples of contradictions. They
would let everyone judge for themselves. But I don't want to overload the
conference. Also, reading a *text* which proves how two other *texts*
contradict each other is extremely tiring. Things get hopelessly
ensnarled and texts get intolerably long.

I have chosen a middle approach. Just a few examples plus general
comments.

There are various kinds of contradictions. Not all are easy to show when
one wants to keep the post short. The easiest ones are when Prabhupada
contradicts himself, or when he contradicts reality. These do not bother
me so much, precisely because they are easy to sort out.

More difficult ones are where Prabhupada's statement, or its logical
consequence, contradicts another of his statements or their consequences.
These you will generally only catch when you are either translating a

text or searching to form an overall picture of Prabhupada's views on a specific subject. I don't have these kinds of examples at my fingertips, but I and the other BBT translators have seen them (and despaired over them) a lot.

To avoid misunderstandings: when a quote is presented where SP contradicts himself or makes a controversial statement, devotees usually find ways of reconciling the problem, and these ways are often valid. This also holds true for some of the contradictions I will post here. So let us not waste time showing how "here he meant this, and there he meant that, therefore what he said makes perfect sense." I know it does. There was always a rationale behind what he said. And even when we cannot figure out what the rationale was, we can always resort to explanations like "acintya,"

"meant to teach us a lesson," "meant to bewilder the asuras," or, like in a recent post here, when an argument was made that Prabhupada gave sannyas to his young ksatriya-like disciples, which caused so many falldowns, another member reconciled the problem by proposing that:

>Sometimes doing the right thing is not to give an example, but to
>speed up the process of things happening. When Narada muni told
>Kamsa about Krsna taking birth, was it to give an example on how
>to act correctly? No, it was done to speed up the process.

So one can always say, in the worst case, that SP did the wrong thing on purpose, to speed things up. There are always ways and means, even though Ockham's razor would probably cut many of them.

But this is not my point. Since you state that Srila Prabhupada never contradicts himself, all I want to show is that he does. I will choose the short and easy examples, even if they are not the ones with most important implications for our lives.

Examples will come in the next two texts under the same header, with some general observations. Those who do not wish to read them can skip them.

Your servant,
Dhyana-kunda dasi

----- End of forwarded message -----
(Text COM:2715734) -----

----- Forwarded message -----
Date: Tue, 19 Oct 99 11:41 +0200
From: "COM: Dhyanakunda (dd) KKD (NE-BBT, Almvik - S)"
<Dhyanakunda.KKD@bbt.se>
To: Topical Discussions <topical.discussions@bbt.se>
Subject: Contradictions in Prabhupada's words? - 2

EXAMPLE 1. HOW MANY SYLLABLES DOES THIS MANTRA HAVE?

SB 2.7.8 purp.

Prince Dhruva was initiated by Narada into chanting the hymn composed of eighteen letters, namely om namo bhagavate vasudevaya,

SB 4.8.58 purp.

One can meditate upon offering and chant the twelve-syllable mantra, om

namo bhagavate vasudevaya.

SB 6.8.7 verse translation:

Then one should chant the mantra composed of twelve syllables [om namo bhagavate vasudevaya].

EXAMPLE 2. HOW MANY YUGAS ARE THERE IN ONE MANU'S LIFE?

SB 3.22.35 purp:

seventy-one of such yugas is the duration of the life of a Manu,

SB 2.7.37 purp:

In the duration of life of one Manu there are more than seventy-two Kali-yugas,

EXAMPLE 3. WAS BALARAMA WITH THE BOYS IN THE PASTIME OF KILLING AGHASURA?

SB 10.13.28 purp:

Even Balarama did not know that all the calves and cowherd boys were expansions of Krsna or that He Himself was also an expansion of Krsna.

(Dhkdd: Context makes it clear Balarama is there with all others.)

KB 12:

Desiring to swallow all the boys at once, including Krsna and Balarama, he sat on the path.

SB 10.13.40 purp:

On the day when Lord Brahma had first come [Dhkdd: this is the day when Aghasura was killed], Baladeva could not go with Krsna and the cowherd boys, for it was His birthday, and His mother had kept Him back for the proper ceremonial bath, called santika-snana. Therefore Lord Baladeva was not taken by Brahma at that time.

EXAMPLE 4. MARRIAGE

SB 7.12.11 purp:

A brahmana generally remains a brahmacari throughout his entire life, but although some brahmanas become grhasthas and indulge in sex life, they do so under the complete control of the spiritual master.

(Dhkdd: This implies only a minority of all brahmanas marry. It also implies that, as grhasthas, they remain under constant control of their gurus.)

SB 7.15 summary

Among the brahmanas, some are householders and are mostly attached to fruitive activities or the betterment of social conditions. Above them, however, are brahmanas who are very much attracted by austerities and penances and who retire from family life. They are known as vanaprasthas. (Dhkdd: In this general description the brahmana community SP mentions attached grhasthas and vanaprasthas. He disregards the naisthika brahmacaris, who seemed to comprise the bulk of brahmanas in the quote above. This is not a logically absolute contradiction, but it does create confusion. A very common problem in SP's writings, mostly stemming from

overgeneralization.)

Mayapur, March 18, 1976

760318SB.MAY

Here especially the ksatriyas, they marry many wives. There is purpose also. The ksatriyas are allowed in this way. Why? Because ksatriyas are...

Generally they are king. They have got money to maintain many wives. They can do it. And they eat also very first-class vitaminous food also, so they have energy. Even our Krsna, He also married as a ksatriya so many wives. So, not like Krsna or any other, but everyone wants to keep more than one wife. Everyone wants. That is his heart's desire. And if one is able actually, he keeps.

(Dhkdd: Does everyone -- meaning all men -- in this conference want to keep more than one wife?)

EXAMPLE 5. HOW MANY VERSES DOES THE 2ND CHAPER OF THE 2ND CANTO HAVE?

"...regarding the purport, 2nd paragraph to Bhagavatam 2.2.38, it is clear. Do not try to change anything." (letter to Gopiparanadhana, 28 Sep.

1976) (Dhkdd: verse 2.2.38 does not exist.)

EXAMPLE 6. ARE ALL GRHASTHAS KARMIS?

IF MARRIAGE IS NOT ALLOWED TO A BRAHMACARI, IS IT SO THAT ONLY PEOPLE WHO HAVE NEVER BEEN BRAHMACARIS BECOME GRHASTHAS?

DOES A BRAHMACARI BECOME A KARMI WHEN HE MARRIES?

Morning Walk, March 19, 1976 Mayapura

According to Vedic civilization, marriage is allowed to the karmis. It is not that marriage allowed to the sannyasi or brahmacari. The karmis require sex. Therefore.... Why marriage is allowed to the grhastha? Why not to the brahmacari, vanaprastha or sannyasi? Why it is not recommended?

Because the karmis require that enlivenment. Therefore they are allowed to marry. So in the European civilization it is only karmis.

EXAMPLE 6. IS THE WHOLE WORLD FULL OF GIRL CHILDREN (STATISTICS)?

The whole world is full of girls, girl children. Why? There is no potency. Potency finished. Or impotent. And if you keep one boy brahmacari, no sex life, and get him married, the first child must be a boy, must be, without any doubt. (morning walk, March 19th, 1976 Mayapura)

(Dhkdd: Jagannatha Misra, Lord Caitanya's father, had eight daughters before he got his two sons. He must have had lots of illicit sex before, or...? Kardama had nine daughters before he got his son. How about Prabhupada's own father? in Bhakti Caru Maharaja's film it looks like

Prabhupada has many elder sisters but no brothers.)

I want to share one more example. It comes in the next text.

----- End of forwarded message ---

----- Forwarded message -----

Date: Tue, 19 Oct 99 11:41 +0200

From: "COM: Dhyanakunda (dd) KKD (NE-BBT, Almvik - S)"

<Dhyanakunda.KKD@bbt.se>

To: Topical Discussions <topical.discussions@bbt.se>

Subject: contradictions in Prabhupada's writings? - 3

I have singled out this example since it's a different kind of contradiction. Not a logical one but rather psychological. Prabhupada first exhibits a very negative attitude toward one Richard, and a few sentences later, he becomes quite positive about him and sees good qualities in him. What has changed?

This kind is what bothers me, personally, perhaps more than the simpler kinds. I just have a big problem trusting persons who label others so easily and so unpredictably.

(garden conversation, Sept. 6, 1976 Vrndavan)

Prabhupada: Let them chant whatever. We shall chant like this, Panca-tattva-sri-krsna-caitanya prabhu nityananda sri-advaita gadadhara srivasadi-gaura-bhakta-vrnda. I've explained that. Five features of Lord Caitanya.

Aksayananda: He chants that mantra on his beads.

Prabhupada: Who?

Aksayananda: That boy Richard in Radha-kunda.

Prabhupada: Rascal. That is his bad association. Therefore I say don't follow these so-called Radha-kunda babajis. Nara-kunda babaji. And they smoke bidi. I have seen. Richard is still there?

Aksayananda: Yes. He's in very bad health.

Prabhupada: But he has got money. Spending money there?

Aksayananda: I haven't been there for a long time, but I just heard about.

Prabhupada: No, he has got money. How he is spending?

Harikesa: He has hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Prabhupada: Where it is?

Harikesa: Probably in New York.

Prabhupada: So he does not bring that?

Harikesa: Yes, he has money all the time.

Aksayananda: Dhananjaya prabhu, he went to see him and he said he was dying. He's supposed to pass off. And he said that he had written a will and on the will he had left most of his money to ISKCON.

Prabhupada: Accha?

Caranaravindam: He loves you very much. Actually, he's very attracted to you Srila Prabhupada.

Prabhupada: Oh. Why does he not come to us? He likes Radha-kunda.

Caranaravindam: He loves Radha-kunda.

Prabhupada: Determination. No, if he's in difficulty he may come. We can take care of him.

.....

Another things that bothers me is that Srila Prabhupada is always so sure of himself. He is fully confident in his own judgment. He is fully confident that the world is full of girls, that in certain places all people are rascals, that "Bad things means Western type of civilization," etc. Very strong, super simple black-and-white general statements. Where ordinary people would soften their statements by saying, "as far as I know," "I am convinced that," "to some degree," "in this respect," "from my experience," "most probably," "at present it looks like..." etc.,

Srila Prabhupada passes absolute judgements, and he is not even consistent in them.

I am ready to believe the source of his certainty is direct link with Krsna's absolute knowledge, *if* it can be proven he was absolutely right each time.

Up till then, I will rather suppose Prabhupada's absolute self-confidence was a feature of his own individual character.

Ys Dhkdd

4. Letters from Madhusudani Radha d.d. to Mahananda dasa regarding her decision to obstruct him from the Topical Discussion conference:

1) Date: Tue, 19 Oct 99 10:22 -0800
From: "COM: Madhusudani Radha (dd) JPS (Mill Valley - USA)"
<Madhusudani.Radha.JPS@bbt.se>
To: Mahananda1 <Mahananda1@aol.com>,
Topical Discussions <topical.discussions@bbt.se>
Subject: decision

> I request that devotees that think that this permissive attitude that allows
>this blatant depicting of our founding acarya is such an offensive light--
>write to the overseers of COM itself, in the hopes that bringing it to their
>attention will end this great slap in our beloved guru's face. To hear from
>several devotees in protest will get their attention.

This is a threat
>

>I am afraid the poor girl

Dhyanakunda Prabhu is a grown woman. Don't belittle her. (this is not necessarily a rule violation, just wanted to let you know)

>

>I am afraid the poor girl who was concerned that her postings getting out to
>the wrong persons is going to realize her worst fears because these words,
>now posted publicly about our beloved master, may very well become the topic
>of concern in many quarters of our movement,
>regretfully, Mahananda dasa

This is an intimidation attempt.

Taken together with your many recent texts in which you have put down or threatened other members (telling them they're offensive, that they're ruining their spiritual lives, requesting others not to associate with them etc), your position is becoming very clear. You can not tolerate other people's having opinions that are different from yours or their using their own brains. You do not even want them to have a forum or voice where they can discuss their understanding with each other. This is called intolerance.

Although other people may see prabhupada as more of a human being and less "god-like" than you do and they may feel that he has made mistakes about material matters, without feeling that this detracts from his ability to give us krsna, *you* have taken it upon yourself to judge that this constitutes an offense, that your view of Prabhupada is the only right one and that everyone else is a blasphemer.

Regretfully, you leave me no other option but to remove you from this conference. You have received numerous warnings and been given the benefit of the doubt more times than any other member. You know what the conference rules are, and in spite of your assurances to the contrary, it appears obvious that you have no intention of following them. It's obvious that this is not an appropriate forum for you. Fortunately, there are many other forums where you will feel more comfortable. Best wishes.

Ys,
Madhusudani dasi

5. Email #2 from Mother Madhusudani Radha d.d. to Mahananda dasa regarding participation in Topical Discussion conference:

Date: Tue, 19 Oct 99 10:27 -0800
From: "COM: Madhusudani Radha (dd) JPS (Mill Valley - USA)"
<Madhusudani.Radha.JPS@bbt.se>
To: Mahananda1 <Mahananda1@aol.com>,
Topical Discussions <topical.discussions@bbt.se>
Subject: Re: thinks it's time for me to leave

Mahananda ">"

>I do follow the rules. If you don't like me then remove me if you are so
>wanting to. No where have I insulted anyone or put any one down.

MRdd: Sorry, I disagree and just sent you a text informing you of such examples and of your removal.

> If you do not want me there, just tell me. No hard feelings.

MRdd: I do want you there, but without the threats and put downs. You do have something to contribute and your literalism is a welcome viewpoint (but it's not the only one). So is your deification of Prabhupada. But it's equally acceptable for some to see Prabhupada as an empowered human being who made some material mistakes but who nevertheless is able to give us Krsna. Maybe you can rejoin after a cool-down break?

[She treats a 30+ year devotee like a child who needs a cool down break.]

6. Mother Madhusudani Radha d.d. states without proof that 80% of patients at sex clinics are vaisnavas engaging in activities of sodomy, drunkenness, etc.

Date: Tue, 23 Nov 99 18:31 -0800

From: "COM: Madhusudani Radha (dd) JPS (Mill Valley - USA)"

<Madhusudani.Radha.JPS@bbt.se>

To: COM: India (Continental Committee) Open (Forum) <india.open@bbt.se>,

Varnasrama development <varnasrama.development@bbt.se>,

cshannon <cshannon@mdo.net>,

Mahat <Mahat@aol.com>,

COM: (International) Women's Ministry <women's.ministry@bbt.se>,

COM: Babhru (das) ACBSP (San Diego - USA) <babhru.acbsp@bbt.se>

Subject: Vedic India?

<snip> This is the way the letter was received with some sections removed [Ed.]

Here are some facts: 95% of the Indian men (80% Hindu, who were mostly Vaisnavas) who show up in the dermatology clinics of two large Mumbai hospitals had visited sex workers in the past 3 months. 63% of them reported that they got drunk on a regular basis, 16% of the men in one hospital and 39% in another hospital reported having had anal sex with other men in the past 3 months. Outreach workers can tell you which parks, train stations and public restrooms where this happens. (same in Delhi and Calcutta) and I can forward that information to anyone who wants to check for himself.

<snip>

Indian truck drivers (nation wide) who were interviewed at several rest stops reported an average of 20 sex partners per month. These encounters included both male and female sex workers, as well as their co-drivers (assistants) giving them blow jobs.

<snip>

Ys,
Madhusudani dasi

7. Letters from Madhusudani Radha d.d. stating reasons for refusing a devotee admission to Topical Discussion conference:

[Text 2725709 from COM]
Sent: Sunday, October 24, 1999 9:12 PM
Subject: Topical Discussions

It's a public conference on COM, only non-COM members need to be added by the organizers.

Before I add you, I'd like to make sure you've read and agree with the rules of the conference? Did you see the announcement?

Briefly, this is a place where devotees can express themselves openly, including all their doubts without having to fear being called "offensive", without any put-downs, without being threatened and intimidated etc. All sources of evidence are acceptable, inc. sastra, science, and one's own brain and logic and no one gets to criticise anyone else for that. You may disagree with other people's opinions or facts, but you have to do so in a respectful way. If someone says for example that they have concerns about places in which Prabhupada appears to be contradicting himself, you may explain why you don't see any contradiction, but you may not say that these people are ruining their spiritual lives by even suggesting that Prabhupada could do such a thing. If you are not comfortable with this model, this is not the conference for you, as you will be constantly frustrated and will have a chilling effect on the free speech that we're working very hard to cultivate. We believe that many people have left and continue to leave ISKCON due to having received such intimidating messages in the past. And those reactions have not cleared up anyone's doubts.

SO if you still want to join, please let me know. Or you can also write to the co-organizer, who is cc'd on this text.

Ys,
Madhusudani dasi

Sent: Monday, October 25, 1999 9:24 PM
Subject: RE: Topical Discussions

Thank you for stating that you won't curtail anyone's free speech. Does that mean that you won't tell anyone that they're ruining their spiritual lives if they have doubts in Prabhupada or talk about "contradictions" in his writings? Will you not tell them that they're destined for hell for disagreeing with Prabhupada, nor call them "blasphemers"?

Will you refrain from pulling rank due to being a Prabhupada disciple if a junior disagrees with you?

Will you refrain from criticising members for using their own brains, logic or common sense instead of basing all their answers on sastra?

Will you refrain from criticising them for using other sources that Prabhupada's books when considering the various issues discussed?

Will you refrain from telling them that their time for doubt should have been restricted to *prior to* initiation only and that now, once

initiated, they have no right to express doubts?

These are issues that have all been discussed already and the members want to move on to actually discussing the topics on their minds and in their hearts, but without having to deal with the above objections. They have already heard those many, many times, on COM and in their temple communities.

This conference is a safe space in which all thoughts and doubts can be discussed in a respectful manner.

We believe that these doubts exist out there and that the only way to deal with them is to do so in a safe and open space. By intimidating or threatening those who are opening up, we only drive them under ground or out of ISKCON.

Then they'll go to the ritviks, or to NM or somewhere else. They may even leave KC all together, feeling that they don't want to be a part of such an intolerant religion.

I'm not saying that this conference is for everyone. Some people find it too painful to listen to doubts. That's why we're only allowing members who can agree to the above. Having the discussion on the mirror forum in an un-organized way, didn't work. It led to people having parallel discussions that were not seen by the COM members. Thus they felt that their words were being discussed behind their backs. It also meant that anyone could join even if s/he did not agree with the conference guidelines.

Hope this is clearer now. You can reply to me at either this address or my COM address. However, if you reply to COM, please delete my text, or I can't see what you wrote on the tiny Telnet screen available to me here in Malaysia.

Ys,
Madhusudani dasi

8. Harsi dasa commenting on Srila Prabhupada's opinion regarding women attending varnasrama college

Harsi (das) HKS (Timisoara - RO) wrote in his com text 2847711:

- > Is it not imposing gender consciousness when Prabhupada says that
- > women cannot attend Varnasrama College?
- > Is it not imposing gender consciousness when Prabhupada says that
- > "girls" gurukula is a concoction?

What do I care what Prabhupada says or didn't say, shouldn't the question rather be what is the truth - and the truth, I think is, that knowledge about social and material affairs is relative, even if it may come from Prabhupada.

9. Harsi dasa writing again about his opinions towards aspects of Srila Prabhupada's teachings regarding varnasrama:

- > India.Open@bbt.se, Women's.Ministry@bbt.se
- >To: "COM: DMW (Dharma of Men and Women)" <DMW@bbt.se>,

> "COM: India (Continental Committee) Open (Forum)"
<India.Open@bbt.se>,
> "COM: Varnasrama development" <Varnasrama.development@bbt.se>,
> "COM: (International) Women's Ministry" <Women's.Ministry@bbt.se>,
> "Jivan Mukta Dasa" <btb@georgian.net>, djwarre@excite.com
>Subject: The truth counts...
>[Text 2848954 from COM]

>

>> If you or anyone else *really* wants to know the truth, then you had
>> better ***care what Prabhupada says or didn't say*** because he is the
>> pure representative of Krsna. Haven't you realized that yet?

>

> Having obtained "real knowledge" from a self-realized soul, you will never
>again fall into such illusion, for "by this knowledge" you will see that all
>living beings are but part of the Supreme, or, in other words, that they are
>Mine.
> Sri Krsna in the Bhagava-gita 4.35

>

>So is "real knowledge" which needs to be obtained for the purpose of
>realizing the Supreme and our constitutional position in relation to Him,
>the knowledge that:

>

> Prabhupada says women cannot take sannyasa?
> Prabhupada says that women cannot attend Varnasrama College?
> Prabhupada says that "girls" gurukula is a concoction?
> Prabhupada says that women are like fire and men like butter?
> Prabhupada say that "there is a difference between male and female that
>exists even in the higher statuses of life-in fact, even between Lord Siva
>and his wife?"
> Prabhupada says that women should not be in Vrndavana?
> Prabhupada says that women should not be given freedom or independence?
> Prabhupada says that women are less intelligent?
> Prabhupada says that the Aryan civilization is being insulted by having a
>female as its chief executive?
> Prabhupada says that "it is most regrettable when a woman becomes the
>executive head instead of a lionlike king."
> Prabhupada says that women cannot have equal rights?
> Prabhupada says that the brain size of woman is smaller than that of a man
>therefore the woman are less intelligent than man.
> Prabhupada says that woman without husband are like prostitutes,
> or whatever he may have said about such material or social matters.

>

> He said also in the purport to the above verse:
>
>"Perfect knowledge, received from the Supreme Personality of Godhead, is the
>path of liberation. The boat of Krsna consciousness is very simple, but at
>the same time the most sublime."

>

>So are all the above mentioned "Prabhupada said,s" perfect knowledge,
>received from the Supreme Personality of Godhead revealed to his pure

>representative devotee in order to show us the path of liberation?
>
>I doubt this. I think that many such statement of Prabhupada are relative
>truth which may or may not be aplicable to the situation or the person or
>the gender.
>There are less inteligent woman as there are also less inteligent man, to
>give an example.
>A woman without a husband may or may not be like a prostitute etc.
>
>Am I offending Srila Prabhupada by saying this?
>
>I hope not.
>
>ys, Harsi das
>

(Text COM:2864753) -----

10. Dvaipayana dasa co-coordinator of Topical Discussions conference) commenting on postings from Mother Dhyanakunda d.d.

In a message dated 10/19/1999 7:40:15 AM Eastern Daylight Time,
Dvaipayana.Vyasa.RSD@bbt.se writes:

> Another things that bothers me is that Srila Prabhupada is always so
>sure of himself. He is fully confident in his own judgment. He is fully
> confident that the world is full of girls, that in certain places all
> people are rascals, that "Bad things means Western type of
>civilization," etc. Very strong, super simple black-and-white general
> statements.Where ordinary people would soften their statements by saying,
> "as far as I know," "I am convinced that," "to some degree," "in this
> respect," "from my experience," "most probably," "at present it looks
> like..." etc., Srila Prabhupada passes absolute judgemnts, and he is not >
even consistent in them.
>
This was a good analysis. It bothered me as well, though I never understood
so clearly what is exactly wrong, except maybe subconsciously.

11. Mother Hare Krsna dasi postulating Srila Prabhupada being susceptible to errors on the "material" platform:

COM: Hare Krsna dasi (Brunswick, Maine - USA)
Thu, 28 Oct 99 17:04 -0400

I appreciated Sri Rama prabhu's letter, and Harsi prabhu's commentary here is also food for thought.

Maybe we need to distinguish between Srila Prabhupada's Goals, which are transcendental, and his Methods which may not always have worked. My goal may be to go the the temple for a Govardhana Puja celebration. So, I get in my car and drive away. The car breaks down.

So, what do we make of this? Points to consider:

1. My goal is still transcendental, or at least something that can aid spiritual development.
2. My method of getting to the temple -- driving my car -- is material. It should help me get there, but as we can see, in this case it did not work.

3. What if Srila Prabhupada had told me to drive my car to the temple to attend Govardhana puja. Would I have to say that I am doubting the transcendental potency of his word if I don't persist in my attempt to go there in my car?

4. What if I decide that the more important instruction of Srila Prabhupada was the Goal -- somehow I must get to the temple to celebrate Govardhana Puja -- in that case what are my options?:

A. Take a bus, or get a ride from someone else.

B. Have someone fix my car -- as long as I can afford to do this -- and as long as it won't take too long.

C. Get the car fixed, even if it takes a long time, and go to the Govardhana Puja celebration next year.

D. Sit down and cry that I am unworthy and cannot fulfill Prabhupada's instructions.

So, it seems important for us to recognize that Methods (often involving using aspects of material nature) are different from Goals.

Truthfulness is the last leg of Dharma. This is the only thing left that we have to help us in our attempt to make spiritual advancement. And that is why satyam, truthfulness, is such an important quality of the brahmana -- Prabhupada says that it is the first quality of a brahmana. We cannot make spiritual advancement if we are not willing to be truthful.

So, maybe we have to have the courage to examine Srila Prabhupada's Methods and Goals and see what Methods actually work to achieve Srila Prabhupada's Goals, and in which cases we may need to modify the Methods in order to achieve the Goals he set for us. I'm not talking about basic standards such as following the regulative principles, but things which are actually Methods, and whose effectiveness depends at least to some degree on our material surroundings, including the material culture that surrounds us.

Consider the following:

Goal: Protection of children, helping them become happy, healthy Krsna conscious adults.

Method: Gurukula training

Results: Gurukula attracted pedophiles and was often staffed by people who though in another situation would have been good devotees, proved to have little ability to supervise and inspire children, and ended up abusing them instead. Many children turned away from the Krsna consciousness movement as a result. Response: Let's look at education and raising children again, and try to find a way to fix gurukulas or another way to protect our children and inspire them with Krsna consciousness.

Goal: Protection of women so they would be chaste and Krsna conscious. Method: Keep women in a dependent position in society Results: This invited men who wanted to abuse women and the abused women had a hard time getting out of their situation because they had no training for anything else. Many women left ISKCON.

Response: Re-evaluate the situation. Find another way of protecting women by promoting respect of women as mothers, by respecting their range of abilities to do devotional service and giving them opportunities to do so. Find other ways to promote the goals of chastity and developing Krsna consciousness in women.

Goal: Protection of cows.

Method: Establish communal farms with centralized dairy herds. Results: Usually, the maintenance of the dairy herds fell to a few lowly-regarded brahmacaris to whom no GBC would take the time to monitor. As a result, they became uninspired to keep up their service. Neglected farm communities struggled and dwindled. Lacking competent and well-cared for herdsmen, the cows became abused on many farms.

Response: Re-evaluate our farms. Work to provide training for our young devotees and to give them land so that they can get married and take care of cows in a family situation. Work to develop varnasrama colleges for the development of self-sufficient Krsna conscious villages. Find other means that will help protect Krsna's cows.

Goal: Protecting ISKCON's assets, assuring the good character of ISKCON's leaders, assuring cooperation of devotees

Method: Oath of loyalty to ISKCON, stress submission to authority Results: Untrained leaders sometimes misuse and even steal ISKCON's assets, and it is often difficult to prosecute them. Sometimes sadistic individuals are attracted to leadership positions which promise almost absolute power over others. Instead of helping spread Krsna consciousness, they drive devotees out of ISKCON

Response: Instead of using an oath of loyalty to protect ISKCON, why not (1) a background check on leaders and administrators; (2) Careful assessment of their character, public relations ability, and ability to act responsibly under stress; (3) signed contract agreeing to uphold the regulative principles and the laws of ISKCON (4) leadership training. And find other ways to support the development of good leaders in ISKCON. We also need to stress training of our devotees never to become blind followers, and to refuse to cooperate with so-called leaders who act against the interests of ISKCON and against the interests of spreading Krsna consciousness.

The point of these examples is that Srila Prabhupada had certain Goals which are important for our spiritual development. He also instituted certain methods to achieve those goals. When he was personally present with us, he demonstrated a willingness to change methods which did not adequately work to achieve his goals. For example, he stated that book distribution could only be done by devotees wearing devotee clothing. But, in the context of Western society, it was demonstrated to him that it was more effective to distribute books by wearing non-devotee clothing. So, he changed the rule. He was more attached to the Goal of distributing transcendental literature as widely as possible than he was to the Method of wearing devotee clothes.

Now it is falling to us to see which of Prabhupada's Methods work to achieve the Goals he set. Many of his methods do work. I believe that chanting 16 rounds of Hare Krsna every day definitely helps maintain Krsna consciousness. But maybe we have to have the honesty to admit that some of the methods that he laid out do not effectively work to achieve the goals he wanted. It's very difficult for us to consider changing any of Srila Prabhupada's methods, but to actually reach the goals he set before us, maybe we have to re-assess how well the methods actually work. Maybe we have to be honest enough to see where a change in methods would actually be a better way of fulfilling the goals he had for us.

your servant,

Hare Krsna dasi

12. Email posting stating that the criticism of Srila Prabhupada has spread to other conferences:

Letter COM:2813372 (24 lines)

From: (Bhakti Brnga) Govinda Swami

Date: 27-Nov-99 21:55 -0500

Here is a suggestion:

Immediately Stop the com conferences where the criticism of Srila Prabhupadatakes place. Vast ... German Forum ... Slovenian forum ... whatever, cancel the forum and quit delaying action in the name of protection of women, intellectualism, or whatever.

13. Madhusudani Radha suggesting that a study be conducted to see if Srila Prabhupada was in some manner responsible for the child abuse experienced in the movement:

Letter COM:2807778 (78 lines)

From: Prithu (das) ACBSP

Date: 25-Nov-99 17:24 -0500

Subject: on closing all COM conferences

Prithu dasa quoting email postings of Mother Madhusudani Radha d.d.:

- > During my interviews with gurukula alumni during the past year and a half I
- > met lots of wonderful Krsna Conscious young adults who were struggling to
- > reconcile the fact that Srila Prabhupada had been aware of at least some of
- > the abuse, with the fact that he had not (as far as any of us know) moved
- > heaven and earth to stop it. I'm not sure it's fair to say that all of
- > those youth are simply fault-finders. Yes, there may be a small minority
- > (less than a handful) who are very bitter and unable to see any good in

- > Prabhupada or his movement, but I don't think we can generalize this to the
- > majority of abused alumni.
- >
- > Most of them are simply trying to make sense of their experiences. From a
- > psychological standpoint, we should be very surprised if this does *not*
- > involve an examination of Prabhupada's role. The treatment they endured
- > and witnessed was extreme. How could it not make them question everything
- > and everyone around them - including the person who is ISKCON's founder
- > acarya?
- >
- > Ys,
- > Madhusudani

- > We can't generalize from one case and say that it means that Prabhupada
- > does not share any blame for what happened to the youth. I'm not saying
- > that he is to blame, just that one instance (or even two or three) is not
- > enough data from which to draw that conclusion. We'd need much more data,
- > gathered in a scientifically acceptable way, to be able to make general
- > statements. And we are trying to remain academic here, right? :-)
- >
- > Ys,
- > Madhusudani

14. BBT policy re. COM conferences:

Letter COM:2728458 (29 lines)
From: Brahma Muhurta Das (NE BBT)
Date: 25-Oct-99 20:04 -0400

Subject: Credit where credit is due

>> There is a serious problem on COM.
---snip---
>> What is the purpose of COM?

COM was created some 14 years ago to facilitate the communication amongst the staff of the North European BBT (NE BBT), and the communication between the NE BBT and the temples and preaching centers it serves. We needed an electronic BBS because our staff was spread out all over Europe, and because the devotees who decided, together with the NE BBT, which books to print were also thousands of miles apart.

COM is great for such discussions and technical communication.

COM was not created to promote Krishna Consciousness; it was created to assist in the production of the books which would promote Krishna Consciousness.

I am not in favor of closing down COM because we need it for book production.

But I don't mind to shut down *all* conferences except the ones the BBT needs. I wouldn't want to be dragged into discussions why we had shut down one conference and not the other. All or none. How does that sound?

Back to the roots.
(Text COM:2728458)

15. Applicable GBC Laws in regards to offending Srila Prabhupada, the founder/acarya of ISKCON

8.4.8.1

Offenses against Founder/Acarya and Guru Parampara

A person guilty of denouncing, openly blaspheming, or publicly abandoning loyalty to the Founder-Acarya; the previous Acaryas in the disciplic succession; or Lord Krishna, the Supreme Personality of Godhead, incurs automatic dissociation from ISKCON the right to revoke being reserved to the local Governing Body Commissioner. If the offending person holds a position of spiritual authority the right to revoke the dissociation is reserved to the Governing Body Commission. If the seriousness of the offense warrants a more severe reaction, other measures may be brought to bear, including dismissal from authority, disqualification for initiating, and excommunication.

8.4.8.2.

Offenses against the unity of ISKCON and the guru-parampara.

A person in a position of spiritual authority guilty of creating or attempting to create a schism in ISKCON, for example by culpable destruction of faith in the initiating spiritual master, the Guru-parampara, or the Governing Body Commission, incurs automatic suspension the right to revoke being reserved to the Governing Body Commission. If no rectification is forthcoming, other penalties may be added, including dismissal from spiritual authority and excommunication.

Highlights From a Discussion between assorted GBC members, Sannyasis and Prominent Devotees

(many available postings have been omitted. The following quotes have been chosen because they are representative of both the gist and many turns in the discussion available to us).

16. Letter from H.H. Sivarama Swami beginning debate in regards to offences to Srila Prabhupada

Letter COM:2716734 (46 lines)

From: Sivarama Swami

Date: 21-Oct-99 05:16 -0400

Re: Copy of: What does the GBC say about this

Dear Members

I recently read a series of messages from Madhusdhani Radhe and Dyana Kund dd. I am not receivers of these conferences and this was an isolated CC: I received. Yet it is disturbing these things are going on by ISKCON devotees on an ISKCON sponsored forum. I include some excerpts below and some brief thoughts. Is the GBC not supposed to comment on such opinions about Prabhupada and are they not meant to do anything about them.

"Ahem" (clearing my throat here)

Although I have enough headaches reading this type of poisonous rhetoric

.....

<Although other people may see Prabhupada as more of a human being and less "God-like" than you do and they may feel that he has made mistakes about material matters, without feeling that this detracts from his ability to give us Krsna, *you* have taken it upon yourself to judge that this constitutes an offense, that your view of Prabhupada is the only right one and that everyone else is a blasphemer. MRdd>

.....seems to fall into the category of tolerating blasphemy of devotees. I for one do not want to. It seems the issue of Prabhupada's "material" and "spiritual" guidance should be addressed. As a first step this appears to be the duty of the spiritual master Jayapataka Swami. I am positive he does not see eye to eye with this type of nonsense but I would like to know what he is doing about it.

Your servant

Sivarama Swami

PS

As an addendum, perhaps Krsna Ksetra Prabhu can teach this lady that one cannot make such comments about Lord Caitanya's father...

(Further comments have not been reproduced for the sake of brevity)

17. Hari Sauri Prabhu agreeing with Shyamasundara's concerns:

Letter COM:2724330 (19 lines)

From: Hari Sauri (das) ACBSP

Date: 24-Oct-99 06:34 -0400

> There is a serious problem on COM. You rejected the suggestions made by
> the author---what is your solution? What are the COM standards for
> somebody to start up a forum and become the moderator? How is it that a
> known apasiddhantic person who constantly minimizes and undermines Srila
> Prabhupada and the sastras is allowed not only to be a member of COM but
> to be the moderator of several forums? What is the purpose of COM?

Without wanting to get drawn into an endless debate on this subject I have to at least say that, with all due respect and appreciation for Raktambara prabhu's position, there is indeed a problem with COM being used for things other than its proper purpose, which I take to be the promotion of Krsna consciousness within the ISKCON context. Nowadays there are several forums which are being used to effect the opposite of this purpose and I wonder what is to be done about it. Certainly I don't think it can go on indefinitely and some remedial action needs to be taken. Perhaps its a subject that the GBC body needs to get involved with.

Your humble servant,

Hari-sauri dasa

18. Brahma Muhurta dasa, NE BBT Trustee, providing the rationale behind COM

Letter COM:2728458 (29 lines)

From: Brahma Muhurta Das (NE BBT)
Date: 25-Oct-99 20:04 -0400

>> What is the purpose of COM?

COM was created some 14 years ago to facilitate the communication amongst the staff of the North European BBT (NE BBT), and the communication between the NE BBT and the temples and preaching centers it serves. We needed an electronic BBS because our staff was spread out all over Europe, and because the devotees who decided, together with the NE BBT, which books to print were also thousands of miles apart.

COM is great for such discussions and technical communication. COM was not created to promote Krishna Consciousness; it was created to assist in the production of the books which would promote Krishna Consciousness.

I am not in favor of closing down COM because we need it for book production.

But I don't mind to shut down *all* conferences except the ones the BBT needs. I wouldn't want to be dragged into discussions why we had shut down one conference and not the other. All or none. How does that sound?

Back to the roots.
(Text COM:2728458) -----

19. Brahma Muhurta Dasa agreeing to the closing of COM conferences and requesting feedback from COM sysop, Raktambara dasa:

Letter COM:2733677 (9 lines)
From: Brahma Muhurta Das (NE BBT)
Date: 27-Oct-99 18:01 -0400

Subject: on closing all COM conferences

>Conclusion:

>Lets close all conferences, accept BBT conferences and conferences at present
>conducted by either ISKCON Spiritual masters, GBC or ISKCON sannyasis.
>New conferences can only be opened by members of the 4 categories.

I could agree with that. Raktambara Prabhu and Mukhya dd, what you say?

ysbmd
(Text COM:2733677) -----

20. Hari Sauri dasa commenting that closing all conferences may be too radical

Letter COM:2734158 (17 lines)
From: Hari Sauri (das) ACBSP
Date: 28-Oct-99 00:43 -0400

> But I don't mind to shut down *all* conferences except the ones the
> BBT needs. I wouldn't want to be dragged into discussions why we had
> shut down one conference and not the other. All or none. How does
> that sound?

>

> Back to the roots.

It sounds too radical to me. There are many forums which are run responsibly. I think we need to identify those that are not and deal with them individually. If they are not moderated then put in a moderator. If no one can be found to do the job, shut it down. If they are moderated and the moderator doesn't want to change, remove them and put in someone responsible; otherwise shut it down.

Your humble servant,

Hari-sauri dasa

(Text COM:2734158) -----

21. Bir Krsna Gos. protesting the fact that ISKCON-BBT are paying for conferences criticizing Srila Prabhupada.

Letter COM:2755146 (6 lines)

From: Bir Krishna das Goswami

Date: 04-Nov-99 15:30 -0500

My personal feeling is that ISKCON or the BBT has no business running forums in which people can say any damn thing they want.

They can say any damn thing out there in the big wide world of the internet. There is no question of our censoring free speech. But why does ISKCON-BBT have to pay for and run the arenas of free speech?

(Text COM:2755146) -----

22. Jayapataka Swami agrees that COM should be monitored and moderated:

Letter COM:2759931 (9 lines)

From: Jayapataka Swami (GBC)

Date: 06-Nov-99 17:22 -0500

> My personal feeling is that ISKCON or the BBT has no business running
> forums in which people can say any damn thing they want.

>

> They can say any damn thing out there in the big wide world of the
> internet. There is no question of our censoring free speech. But why does
> ISKCON-BBT have to pay for and run the arenas of free speech?

Anything on COM should be monitored and be within certain limits of decorum and vaisnava etiquette.

(Text COM:2759931) -----

23. GBC member evicted from COM conference for standing up for Srila Prabhupada and complaining about COM-logic

Letter COM:2774991 (26 lines)

From: Prithu (das) ACBSP

Date: 12-Nov-99 21:06 -0500

> <<Recently, several attempts have been made to silence certain members of
> this conference - to stop them from voicing their opinion on Topical
> Discussions - in a rather dirty way. Certain persons who did not like the
> fact that on TD a lot of otherwise untouchable subjects may be discussed,
> approached gurus of persons whose posts they did not like>>

>

- > I read this with incredulity since the mataji sent me three letters
- > attempting to curtail my own free speech when I requested joining the Top.
- > Dis. conference.

Just as I just kicked out of the German conference.
my last message was:

- > I find it most amazing by the end of the day that it seems O.K. to criticize
- > Srila Prabhupada.
- > At the same time it seems unacceptable to complain about it.

That then was the last thing I was able to say, before I got my walking papers.
It obviously was to the point.

yspda

(Text COM:2774991) -----

24. Bhakti Caru Swami suggesting expulsion as punishment for blasphemy of Srila Prabhupada:

Letter COM:2807534 (17 lines)

From: Bhakti Caru Swami

Date: 25-Nov-99 14:59 -0500

Dear Shyamasundara Prabhu,

Please accept my humble obeisances. All glories to Srila Prabhupada. Thank you very much for sending me the informations. I am hereby requesting Bir Krsna Maharaj, the Chairman of the GBC, who is also a member of this conference, to let us know what action he is going to take in order to stop this blasphemy of Srila Prabhupada. My common sense says that anyone who blasphemizes Srila Prabhupada, the Founder-Acarya of ISKCON, should be EXPELLED from ISKCON.

I want to see some immediate action in this regard. I feel this is the worst attack on ISKCON and therefore this should be the most important agenda for the GBC EC to take up.

Your servant,

Bhakti Caru Swami.

(Text COM:2807534) -----

25. Bhakti Caru Swami questioning Jayapataka Swami on his efforts to control his disciple Madhusudani Radha d.d.

Letter COM:2807535 (20 lines)

From: Bhakti Caru Swami

Date: 25-Nov-99 14:59 -0500

Dear Jayapataka Maharaj,

Please accept my humble obeisances. All glories to Srila Prabhupada.

Since you are a member of this conference I presume that you have already read the texts that Shyamasundara Prabhu sent. Since Madhusudani Radha is your disciple I would like to know whether you have taken any measure to correct her. If you still consider that she is your disciple then I think you must do something about saving her from destroying her spiritual life. As a spiritual master of ISKCON your duty is to simply transmit Srila Prabhupada's teachings to your disciples and followers. If any one of them challenges Srila Prabhupada's spiritual authority then your authority also is being challenged, and you must do something about it. As a member of the GBC body also you have the solemn responsibility to defend Srila Prabhupada's position as the Founder-Acarya and the Preeminent Siksa Guru of all the devotees of ISKCON for all time.

Your servant,

Bhakti Caru Swami.

(Text COM:2807535) -----

26. GBC member, Prithu dasa, calls for specific ISKCON laws to be enforced and censure of Madhusudani Radha d.d.:

Letter COM:2807778 (78 lines)

From: Prithu (das) ACBSP

Date: 25-Nov-99 17:24 -0500

> During my interviews with gurukula alumni during the past year and a half I
> met lots of wonderful Krsna Conscious young adults who were struggling to
> reconcile the fact that Srila Prabhupada had been aware of at least some of
> the abuse, with the fact that he had not (as far as any of us know) moved
> heaven and earth to stop it. I'm not sure it's fair to say that all of
> those youth are simply fault-finders. Yes, there may be a small minority
> (less than a handful) who are very bitter and unable to see any good in
> Prabhupada or his movement, but I don't think we can generalize this to the
> majority of abused alumni.

>
> Most of them are simply trying to make sense of their experiences. From a
> psychological standpoint, we should be very surprised if this does *not*
> involve an examination of Prabhupada's role. The treatment they endured
> and witnessed was extreme. How could it not make them question everything
> and everyone around them - including the person who is ISKCON's founder
> acarya?

>
> Ys,
> Madhusudani

> We can't generalize from one case and say that it means that Prabhupada
> does not share any blame for what happened to the youth. I'm not saying
> that he is to blame, just that one instance (or even two or three) is not
> enough data from which to draw that conclusion. We'd need much more data,
> gathered in a scientifically acceptable way, to be able to make general
> statements. And we are trying to remain academic here, right? :-)

>
> Ys,
> Madhusudani

Note that she is calling for a so called academic presentation to show

that Srila Prabhupada is not free from guilt as far as child abuse in ISKCON.

According to scripture a self realized soul is free from the 4 imperfections.
What to speak of being party to child abuse.

I vehemently protest the efforts of this person to drag Srila Prabhupada from his exalted position by this person.

I propose herewith that Madhusudani Radhe be pulled up in front of a pannel and be censored. Instantly.

If that does not make a difference and she continues her blasphemy of the Founder Acarya this person and so called disciple of such and such must be excommunicated from ISKCON.

8.4.8.1

Offenses against Founder/Acarya and Guru Parampara

A person guilty of denouncing, openly blaspheming, or publicly abandoning loyalty to the Founder-Acarya; the previous Acaryas in the disciplic succession; or Lord Krishna, the Supreme Personality of Godhead, incurs automatic dissociation from ISKCON the right to revoke being reserved to the local Governing Body Commissioner. If the offending person holds a position of spiritual authority the right to revoke the dissociation is reserved to the Governing Body Commission. If the seriousness of the offense warrants a more severe reaction, other measures may be brought to bear, including dismissal from authority, disqualification for initiating, and excommunication.

8.4.8.2.

Offenses against the unity of ISKCON and the guru-parampara.

A person in a position of spiritual authority guilty of creating or attempting to create a schism in ISKCON, for example by culpable destruction of faith in the initiating spiritual master, the Guru-parampara, or the Governing Body Commission, incurs automatic suspension the right to revoke being reserved to the Governing Body Commission. If no rectification is forthcoming, other penalties may be added, including dismissal from spiritual authority and excommunication.

AS for the GBC body:

If the GBC does not even act to enforce ISKCON laws when it comes to vilifying Srila Prabhupada the members of the GBC were better off to resign and go into hiding.
In shame.

yspda

(Text COM:2807778) -----

27. Bir Krsna das Goswami chimes in chorus with Bhakti Caru Swami to Jayapataka Swami to control MRdd.

Letter COM:2807942 (21 lines) [W1]

From: Bir Krishna das Goswami

Date: 25-Nov-99 20:00 -0500

Subject: on closing all COM conferences

>Dear Jayapataka Maharaj,

>

>Please accept my humble obeisances. All glories to Srila Prabhupada.

·>

·>Since you are a member of this conference I presume that you have already
·>read the texts that Shyamasundara Prabhu sent. Since Madhusudani Radha is
·>your disciple I would like to know whether you have taken any measure to
·>correct her. If you still consider that she is your disciple then I think
>you must do something about saving her from destroying her spiritual life.
>As a spiritual master of ISKCON your duty is to simply transmit Srila
>Prabhupada's teachings to your disciples and followers. If any one of them
>challenges Srila Prabhupada's spiritual authority then your authority also
>is being challenged, and you must do something about it. As a member of
>the GBC body also you have the solemn responsibility to defend Srila
>Prabhupada's position as the Founder-Acarya and the Preeminent Siksa Guru
>of all the devotees of ISKCON for all time.
>
>Your servant,
>
>Bhakti Caru Swami.

Yes, if don't act the GBC body will have to take some action.
(Text COM:2807942) -----

28. Bhakti Caru Swami encourages Bir Krsna Swami to affirm that Srila Prabhupada's teachings are the basis of ISKCON and that strong action should be taken to ensure that this continues

Letter COM:2808206 (86 lines)
From: Bhakti Caru Swami
Date: 25-Nov-99 23:18 -0500

Dear Bir Krsna Maharaj,

I know how much stressed you already are, and I feel really bad to burden you further. Nevertheless, this is a serious problem and if we do not take action Krsna will not forgive us. He will never tolerate this blasphemy of His pure devotee.

Prithu Prabhu gave the following suggestion. We can positively start from there. In my previous two letters I suggested that Jayapataka Maharaj must take some severe action as her spiritual master. I also suggested that Hridayananada Maharaj, as the head of that conference, also should explain why he allowed this blasphemy to go on without any protest.

ISKCON is Srila Prabhupada's creation. It is founded on his teachings and whoever joins ISKCON must accept his absolute authority. It is the duty of the leaders of ISKCON to make this understanding clear to all the members. If anyone questions Srila Prabhupada's authority and purity then he or she should be corrected. If that person is incorrigible then he or she should be asked to leave this institution.

>
> Note that she is calling for a so called academic presentation to show
> that Srila Prabhupada is not free from guilt as far as child abuse in
> ISKCON.
>
> According to scripture a self realized soul is free from the 4
> imperfections. What to speak of being party to child abuse.
>

- > I vehemently protest the efforts of this person to drag Srila Prabhupada
- > from his exalted position by this person.
- >
- > I propose herewith that Madhusudani Radhe be pulled up in front of a
- > pannel and be censored.
- > Instantly.
- >
- > If that does not make a difference and she continues her blasphemy of the
- > Founder Acarya this person and so called disciple of such and such must be
- > excommunicated from ISKCON.
- >
- > 8.4.8.1
- > Offenses against Founder/Acarya and Guru Parampara
- > A person guilty of denouncing, openly blaspheming, or publicly abandoning
- > loyalty to the Founder-Acarya; the previous Acaryas in the disciplic
- > succession; or Lord Krishna, the Supreme Personality of Godhead, incurs
- > automatic dissociation from ISKCON the right to revoke being reserved to
- > the local Governing Body Commissioner. If the offending person holds a
- > position of spiritual authority the right to revoke the dissociation is
- > reserved to the Governing Body Commission. If the seriousness of the
- > offense warrants a more severe reaction, other measures may be brought to
- > bear, including dismissal from authority, disqualification for
- > initiating, and excommunication.
- >
- > 8.4.8.2.
- > Offenses against the unity of ISKCON and the guru-parampara.
- > A person in a position of spiritual authority guilty of creating or
- > attempting to create a schism in ISKCON, for example by culpable
- > destruction of faith in the initiating spiritual master, the
- > Guru-parampara, or the Governing Body Commission, incurs automatic
- > suspension the right to revoke being reserved to the Governing Body
- > Commission. If no rectification is forthcoming, other penalties may be
- > added, including dismissal from spiritual authority and excommunication.
- >
- > AS for the GBC body:
- >
- > If the GBC does not even act to enforce ISKCON laws when it comes to
- > vilifying Srila Prabhupada the members of the GBC were better off to
- > resign and go into hiding. In shame.
- >
- > yspda
- (Text COM:2808206) -----

29a)Sivarama Swami responds to Bir Krsna dasa Goswami's request for concrete suggestions

Letter COM:2808316 (10 lines)

From: Sivarama Swami

Date: 26-Nov-99 00:33 -0500

BKGM <Just give me some concrete suggestions.>

I suggest

- 1) stoping all com conferences,
- 2) JPS speak wth MSR and give a report

But I you told me the EC was looking into some action, I have been waiting to hear about that.

Sivarama Swami

(Text COM:2808316) -----

29b). Bir Krishna dasa Goswami responds to the widespread calls for action

Letter COM:2810601 (20 lines) [W1]

From: Bir Krishna das Goswami

Date: 26-Nov-99 19:50 -0500

Subject: on closing all COM conferences

[Prithu said:]

>> If the GBC does not even act to enforce ISKCON laws when it comes to

·>> vilifying Srila Prabhupada the members of the GBC were better off to

>> resign and go into hiding.

>> In shame.

>> yspda

>

[HH B.B. Govinda Maharaja Said:]

·>Well spoken, but ... so much has been said on this. What in the world is

·>being done and by whom is it being done ???

·>

·>Why is there so much standing by while these things are being said and

·>done?

I am still waiting for suggestions. It is wonderful that Prithu is saying that we should do something immediately. I agree, but give me some practical suggestions. It is beyond me. Whatever I do I am damned by everyone.

Today I got damned for defending women in our movement from abuse. Also I got damned in letters from some women for not defending them adequately (in my position). Is there anything such as win-win anymore, or has Kali (quarrel) overtaken everyone?

(Text COM:2810601) -----

30. Jayapataka Swami defends MRdd and requests a policy be formulated on proper protocols for COM

Letter COM:2812593 (110 lines)

From: Jayapataka Swami (GBC)

Date: 27-Nov-99 12:40 -0500

Home Base: Sri Mayapur Candrodaya Mandir, Navadwip Dham, Nadia, WB, INDIA

My Dear Godbrother,

Please accept my humble obeisances. All glories to Srila Prabhupada!

Thankyou for your letter cited below with my comments. I have noted the

contents carefully.

- > Dear Jayapataka Maharaj,
- >
- > Please accept my humble obeisances. All glories to Srila Prabhupada.
- >
- > Since you are a member of this conference I presume that you have already
- > read the texts that Shyamasundara Prabhu sent. Since Madhusudani Radha is
- > your disciple I would like to know whether you have taken any measure to
- > correct her. If you still consider that she is your disciple then I think
- > you must do something about saving her from destroying her spiritual life.
- > As a spiritual master of ISKCON your duty is to simply transmit Srila
- > Prabhupada's teachings to your disciples and followers. If any one of them
- > challenges Srila Prabhupada's spiritual authority then your authority also
- > is being challenged, and you must do something about it. As a member of
- > the GBC body also you have the solemn responsibility to defend Srila
- > Prabhupada's position as the Founder-Acarya and the Preeminent Siksa Guru
- > of all the devotees of ISKCON for all time.
- >
- > Your servant,
- >
- > Bhakti Caru Swami.

This is the first time I am seeing these texts. I haven't had time to pay attention to COM. With Puri Maharaja leaving his body here and our performing his samadhi; with SMPDC meetings going on in Mayapur and some restructuring of the local management; with ICC meetings and negotiations with ritvik leaders in Vrindavan; with bhisma pancaka fasting and rituals; and with a myriad of other duties and obligations I didn't read this text earlier. This doesn't seem like a conference but someone sending a text to many persons. Is this a conference? I have never seen such a conference.

That isn't so important. Obviously any offense to Srila Prabhupada is intolerable. I wrote to Madhusudani Radha dd some weeks ago and expressed that leaders were saying she is offending Srila Prabhupada. At that time I didn't have any text sent by anyone to send her. She said that she didn't think she had offended Srila Prabhupada and whether she could be sent the text that was allegedly offensive. She was receptive to me in this regard.

I am surprised that such extreme steps like expelling someone or closing all COM conferences are being proposed. Since in ISKCON Srila Prabhupada has instructed and we have accepted that all GBC's are to act as siksa gurus of the ISKCON devotees why can't any GBC contact Madhusudani Radha dd? Why not give her the benefit of the doubt that she is a sincere devotee. Some of you leaders are discussing with the Ritvik protagonists who are misrepresenting Srila Prabhupada and are splitting His Divine Grace's movement. So she can also be discussed with. Suddenly why is the diksa guru the only one who can talk with someone. Only now has someone sent me the texts she wrote so I will also be discussing with her....

...These things are taking up my time. Therefore I wasn't looking at other conferences or for some time not even looking at COM. Just I looked if Bir Krishna dasa Goswami or Gopal Krishna Goswami wrote me something. Since his text to this group of devotees came to me I realized that something was afoot. Sorry if I am letting anyone down. I am having only a limited capacity and as it is I have a chest cold and bad throat. I am feeling physically tired. On top of that I am asked to fly off to America for a GBC meeting and have to tie up the loose ends before I go... ...While this is going on I haven't had much time to look here where I am being threatened for things I know nothing about. I can empathize with BKG when he expresses frustration at the lack

of a win-win situation. I think no one knows how many things one may have to deal with...

I was thinking that when I am in USA in a weeks time, I could phone up or visit my disciple and discuss the matters with her in depth. I think an exchange of emails would waste a lot of my time and not achieve the desired result. The EC or Sysop could easily request her to refrain from making comments on Srila Prabhupada until a standard of what can be said about Srila Prabhupada is established for COM. She obviously doesn't think she is being offensive. If esteemed leaders feel what she said is offensive then the definition of what comments are acceptable and not acceptable about Srila Prabhupada, Lord Sri Krishna or any esteemed vaisnava should be established and published as standards for all to follow on COM and in any public media if not everywhere. That would immediately safeguard all COM conferences as all organizers would be held responsible to not allow any breach of etiquette in regard to participants of their conferences. So we could solve all the problems at one time, or at least do something towards solving the problems. So why I am finishing resolving all the crisis here in Mayapur before I leave for the GBC get-together in USA you could all decide on an ISKCON Law for prohibiting making offensive statements on COM. A clear definition should be made. Remember Srila Prabhupada wanted ISKCON to be run under a Rule Of Law. Make the Law and then apply it. Not everyone will have as much wisdom as you all do so you can make the Law so that younger devotees can learn what the limits of proper protocol are in talking about Srila Prabhupada.

So I hope this helps. I am sorry I didn't have better news and that my reply turned out a bit too long.

Your servant,

Jayapataka Swami

p.s. I haven't read the texts that Syamasundara dasa has sent as yet.

[Regarding all the blasphemous statements made by Dhyanakunda dd and defended by MRdd, editor]
(Text COM:2812593) -----

31. Bhakti Brnga Govinda Swami makes strong suggestions to Bir Krishna dasa Goswami on appropriate action

Letter COM:2813372 (24 lines)
From: (Bhakti Brnga) Govinda Swami
Date: 27-Nov-99 21:55 -0500
Subject: on closing all COM conferences

> I am still waiting for suggestions. It is wonderful that Prithu is saying

> that we should do something immediately. I agree, but give me some
> practical suggestions. It is beyond me. Whatever I do I am damned by
> everyone.
>
> Today I got damned for defending women in our movement from abuse. Also I
> got damned in letters from some women for not defending them adequately
> (in my position). Is there anything such as win-win anymore, or has Kali
> (quarrel) overtaken everyone?

Here is a suggestion:

Immediately Stop the com conferences where the criticism of Srila Prabhupada takes place. Vast ... German Forum ... Slovenian forum ... whatever, cancel the forum and quit delaying action in the name of protection of women, intellectualism, or whatever.

Suspend MSR and any of her colleagues that propound her ideas (in the name of protection of women or intellectualism) from usage of com, either by way of forums or private mail. In short, suspend her and others com accounts if they are party to this behavior.

Immediately Set up a commission to see if their mentality warrants expulsion from ISKCON.

(Text COM:2813372) -----

32. Bhakti Vikasa Swami echoes sentiments just expressed by Bhakti Brnga Govinda Swami

Letter COM:2813960 (25 lines) [W1]

From: Bhakti Vikasa Swami

Date: 28-Nov-99 06:01 -0500

> I am still waiting for suggestions. It is wonderful that Prithu is saying
> that we should do something immediately. I agree, but give me some
> practical suggestions. It is beyond me. Whatever I do I am damned by
> everyone.
>

Prithu Prabhu has already made a practical suggestion, and has quoted the GBC rules in this regard. What to do seems clear. There is sufficient evidence to suggest serious offenses against Srila Prabhupada and other pure devotees. It should be clearly ascertained whether or not this is so, a definition of what constitutes "Offense" drawn up, all effort made to explain to those who don't understand if they are making offenses, and if they still stick to their position, they should be expelled. I would be glad to be damned by those who don't accept this.

> Today I got damned for defending women in our movement from abuse. Also I
> got damned in letters from some women for not defending them adequately
> (in my position). Is there anything such as win-win anymore, or has Kali
> (quarrel) overtaken everyone?

Arjuna said pretty much the same thing. There is a time when we have to choose the right thing, even if it means going against those we have affection for. There was no win-win at Kuruksetra, nor is there anywhere in the material world. It's all lose-lose. Those who step on the side of Krsna always win; those who don't always lose.

(Text COM:2813960) -----

33. Jayapataka Swami reaffirms his earlier call for non-expulsion and establishment of protocols

Letter COM:2823281 (44 lines)

From: Jayapataka Swami (GBC)

Date: 01-Dec-99 14:11 -0500

Subject: on closing all COM conferences

- > > Immediately Stop the com conferences where the criticism of Srila
- > > Prabhupada takes place. Vast ... German Forum ... Slovenian forum
- > > whatever, cancell the forum and quit delaying action in the name of
- > > protection of women, intellectualism, or whatever.

- >
- > You should check the German forum and see if they are actually
- > blaspheming Srila Prabhupada or not. At least the organizer Hariballabha
- > doesn't think so, and she says the recent criticism was a chance to
- > discuss and come to a favorable conclusion. Given the circumstances of the
- > German yatra I think some leeway should be applied if the outcome is
- > positive and the organizer is actually a dedicated ISKCON person. However,
- > people like Mad. Rad. should be severely if not permanently censored.
- >> > Immediately Set up a commission to see if their mentality warrants
- > > >expulsion from ISKCON.
- >
- > Yes, agreed.
- >
- > Your humble servant,
- > Hari-sauri dasa

After I met with Hari (HKP) this September, on the request of the Russian Leaders and with approval of the EC, I realized that he is filled with direct and indirect criticism, doubts, about things that happened during Srila Prabhupada's presence. Although he wasn't openly discussing these things in his public lectures, he was occasionally talking about it to various degrees. So I feared that one day if these things came out more publicly how would be deal with it. To push it under the rug leaves us a bit unprepared. Hari Sauri Prabhu's point about how to deal with these doubts reminded me of this. If each conference has strong Organizer(s) who insure that the results are Krishna conscious then isn't that the best safeguard.

Shouldn't some basic etiquette or protocol be established on what is acceptable "academic" discussion and what is crossing the border lines. To just talk about expulsion right off seems like something from the past. I just talked to a (former) disciple who was thrown out of a temple, apparently for economic reasons (lack of money) and ended up being re-initiated in the Gaudiya Math. I think we should be careful how we use the expulsion option. Isn't that a last option?

Your servant,

Jayapataka Swami
(Text COM:2823281) -----

34. MRdd defends VAST discussions

Letter COM:2825992 (93 lines)
From: Bir Krishna das Goswami
Date: 02-Dec-99 12:22 -0500

here is a comment by Madhusudani Radha

=====

As you may already know, VAST is an academic conference, organized by Brahma-tirtha Prabhu and Hridayananda Maharaja. It is set up for devotees in academe to discuss the unique issues encountered there. The reason this conference is not open to others is precisely because of what happened after Syamasundara leaked these texts out of context, and in violation of

conference rules. Devotees in academe are challenged on an almost daily basis and need a safe forum where they can discuss their experiences.

I'm assuming that you are referring to a discussion that took place on Hridayananda Maharaja's conference for devotee scholars almost two years ago. As part of this discussion, different devotees in academe were complaining that current publishing standards by various professional organizations didn't fit with the language used in Srila Prabhupada's books. For example, if you use "non-sexist language" as defined by the publication manual of the American Psychological Association (which is a requirement in that field) you have to use either "he or she" or the plural form "they" when referring to people in general. Anything else is considered "sexist" and as not meeting their standards. I believe that the sociological and anthropological professional organizations have similar definitions. This does not mean that anyone else outside of academe would find this use sexist, nor does it mean that I or any other devotees have stated that Prabhupada's books are sexist. We're not talking about the common use of that word, simply its usage in academe, because that's what the discussion was about. And this is becoming the standard for literature used in university settings.

The second piece of our discussion, which drew a lot of criticism from those not involved, was the brainstorm that followed about how we could resolve the problem of Prabhupada's use of the English language being considered sexist by academic organizations. Please note that at the time that Prabhupada wrote his books, these standards did not exist and he was very eager to have university professors use his texts. However, now, due to changed standards in language use, that is becoming increasingly difficult. So we were simply brainstorming about different ways that this problem could be resolved. One such option included changing the pronouns to fit with currently accepted academic use. Another one was to footnote the books. A third one (and the one that seems to be the one that's actually adopted) was to leave Prabhupada's books the way they are, not use them in settings where they are deemed unacceptable, and to instead have his disciples and granddisciples write their own books to be used in universities.

As you can see, no solution is perfect. Prabhupada wanted his books to be used in universities, but because of a technicality that is becoming increasingly difficult. So what should be done? My suggestion, which has been widely quoted and misunderstood, was to try to interview those who best knew Prabhupada's mood. If it was then concluded e.g. that Prabhupada had not meant simply "he", but rather "he and she" in various places, that would serve to justify changing the language. If not, we shouldn't do this.

What's ironic is that this started out as a discussion among devotees who were frustrated because they *wanted* to use Srila Prabhupada's books in US universities, but were unable to do so due to current publishing standards. They were frustrated exactly because they did appreciate him and they *wanted* to share their appreciation with their students. That was the only reason these options were discussed in the first place. But ever since they were leaked out of context all over cyberspace, people have twisted them to mean that some of us did *not* appreciate Prabhupada and simply found him to be sexist.

Another topic that came up on VAST was whether Prabhupada had to know everything about *material* matters* in order to be a pure devotee. The majority of devotees didn't think so and in fact there are quotes by Srila

Prabhupada where he describes his perfection in terms of following the orders of his spiritual mester and not deviating from the texts. I don't understand why Prabhupada should have to know everything material, including the brain size of men and women. On VAST, some devotees showed that Prabhupada's quotes about 32 vs 64 ounces were outdated information and that Prabhupada was indeed mistaken. *However*, this was not because anyone thought he was anything less than a pure devotee (that was never in question), but because he was quoting a biology professor from his non-devotee college who was using information that is now outdated. To us, that did not mean that we were minimizing Srila Prabhupada. But as academics we need to know these things and be familiar with the sources for these different issues or we're going to look like complete fools and be discredited in academe. That's why it's so important to have such a conference. Without it, devotee scholars don't have anyone they can talk with about these issues that confront them regularly in their service. They *want* to follow Prabhupada's instructions and spread KC to the educated public. However, their challenges are unique and may be easily misunderstood by the main body of devotees. That's why it was confidential and why it was so wrong for Syamasundara to have leaked them.

If you want any of this verified, please write Brahma-tirtha prabhu or Hridayananda Maharaja.

Ys,
Madhusudani dasi
(Text COM:2825992) -----

35. Prithu dasa responds to Jayapataka Swami's call for tolerance

Letter COM:2826198 (129 lines) [W1]

From: Prithu (das) ACBSP

Date: 02-Dec-99 13:43 -0500

Subject: re-Madhusudani Radha

> >Home Base: Sri Mayapur Candrodaya Mandir, Navadvip Dham, Nadia, WB, INDIA

> >

> >> >> I agree. JPS should do this within the next 3 days.

> ·>> ·>

> >>>I am not saying within several weeks. I can be in USA within this

> ·>> week. ·>I am very busy right now as I explained in my letter. Give me 7

> >> days. q·>days isn't practical.

> ·>> OK within 7 days!

> ·>

> ·>Within 6th of December. Please pray for me.

> ·>

> ·>I hope that this finds you in good health.

> ·>> ·>Your servant,

> ·>

> ·>Jayapataka Swami

> I will be talkin to her today.

It is not a matter of talking anymore. She committed aparadha and she needs to be censored and her position as running conferences must be relinquished.

Even in the USA, for all it's liberalism, the school system has come to the

point of Zero Tolerance after teachers being messed around with.

We have been messed around by this women and her followers in a way that talking to them is by no means sufficient.

What needed is action to stem this unwarranted rise of feminism in ISKCON.

Even the Vrindaban incident - as it becomes clear by now - (and what I expected it to be from start - see my message to you one day after it happened) is a clear signal of the rise of feminism paired with total disrespect to the sannyas ashram, GBC authority, ISKCON authority in general by some militant women.

It's symptomatic for this mob rule we are encountering everywhere, women, rtvils, NM people, Gaudya Math in ISKCON, of an all out attempt to take over this society.

I have absolutely no problems with intelligent ladies such as mother ***, mother *** etc. And it is very clear that our men--and especially many members of sannyasa ashram--have vastly contributed to this problem.

However that does not mean that ISKCON can mean a free for all. This is not what Srila Prabhupada had in mind.

Along these lines, what will be accomplished HH JPS talking to Madhusudani Radhe except giving her a slap on the wrist. (Unfortunately I am not very hopeful you will accomplish more than that either.)

We need action, beginning by putting a team of people together to take control of COM with GBC representatives and COM sysops on the same table.

Look, it was never discussed how information leaked out of Basu Gosh's conference. Vast is leaking. Practically every time I say something on the GBC conference mother Hariballaba gets wind of it. I mean how do we know that not even personal letters between us are not viewed by someone. Mother Madhusudani Radhe and her clique of followers are just too well informed about everything which is going on. It might be even better to use the Internet to talk to each other. A lot, if not most or even all what we say to each other is somehow leaking out.

Why is it that ISKCON has become such a mess over the years ?

I think the main reason is that the GBC body has lost much of its credibility simply by failing to act decisively.

This is how the rtviks got out of hand, this is how the present situation is out of hand.

The GBC body "mushy in the middle" - people get away with murder.

Simply talking and talking, no action forth coming, accept, again "somebody will talk to her."

In the meantime one of your own GBC representatives can be kicked off the conference dealing with the place in which he is representing the GBC body and not even a quations is raised.

Why does one want to represent the GBC in the first place if there is no support, no solidarity, not even the question raised if one of your representatives is tossed out a conference by the organiser of that confereecs who is harping day and night on freedom of speech and how in the systems of repression of the past one was not allowed to speak up.

As literally there is such a lack of GBC leadership up there the society has plunged into chaos.

Srila Prabhupada wanted ISKCON to be run by laws.
But what use are laws if they are not being enforced.
What use are COM rules if they are not enforced.
What use is a GBC if the body does not enforce ISKCON laws.
What is the use of suggesting for the up toens time:

> > Here is a suggestion:
> >
> > Immediately Stop the com conferences where the criticism of Srila
> > Prabhupada takes place. Vast ... German Forum ... Slovenian forum
> > whatever, cancel the forum and quit delaying action in the name of
> > protection of women, intellectualism, or whatever.
> >
> > Suspend MSR and any of her colleagues that propound her ideas (in the
> > name of protection of women or intellectualism) from usage of com,
> > either by way of forums or private mail. In short, suspend her and
> > others com accounts if they are party to this behaviour.
> >
> > Immediately Set up a commission to see if their mentality warrants
> > expulsion from ISKCON.
Bhaktivikas M. answering:
>
> Sounds good. Immediately enforce temporary suspensions, investigate, then
> make a final decision.

Bhakti Bringa Govinda M. asking:

SO, AGAIN, WHAT IS HAPPENING ???

NOTHING IS HAPPENING MAHARAJA.

Except that we are well on the way to become a xxxxxx licking society.

yspda
(Text COM:2826198) -----

36. Jayapataka Swami requests a definition on what actually is blasphemy; what is an impropriety and what is an offense

Letter COM:2830102 (43 lines)
From: Jayapataka Swami (GBC)
Date: 04-Dec-99 07:15 -0500

> here is a comment by Madhusudani Radha
> =====
>
> As you may already know, VAST is an academic conference, organized by
> Brahma-tirtha Prabhu and Hridayananda Maharaja. It is set up for devotees

- > in academe to discuss the unique issues encountered there. The reason this
- > conference is not open to others is precisely because of what happened
- > after Syamasundara leaked these texts out of context, and in violation of
- > conference rules. Devotees in academe are challenged on an almost daily
- > basis and need a safe forum where they can discuss their experiences.

In reference to MRdd's comment and explanation could we have then a clear report on what statements are still considered offensive to Srila Prabhupada. What guidelines should be in place for this conference, or any conference, in regard to Srila Prabhupada.

I felt Syamasundara dasa was quoting things out of context and incompletely. However, I can give him the benefit of the doubt, but I cannot discuss with MRdd about her alleged "blasphemy" of Srila Prabhupada unless a very clear description of:

- 1) What was said that is considered objectionable and in what context? What is the explanation of the accused person?
- 2) whether it is considered a blasphemy, an impropriety, an offense or whatever and why it is so considered.
- 3) If these issues come up in Academic or other circles and we have to defend ourselves from these kind of criticisms then it what circle can it be discussed how to do so without risking being branded as a "blasphemer" in trying to find out a solution.
- 4) What standards should there be for a devotee to accuse someone else of being a blasphemer and thrown out of the movement to insure that we don't "burn people at the stake" and have a proper Rule of Justice and Law.
- 5) What step by step remedial measures could be taken for correcting improprieties or offenses rather than going immediately to expelling someone.

If we have these in place then it will be easy enough to deal with any circumstances that arise.

(Text COM:2830102) -----

37. Bhakti Vikasa Swami responds to Mrdd's claim regarding Srila Prabhupada and child abuse

Letter COM:2834889 (69 lines)

From: Bhakti Vikasa Swami

Date: 06-Dec-99 06:22 -0500

Subject: Srila Prabhupada and child abuse

Madhusudani Radha's attempt to exonerate the VAST texts from blame is unconvincing. If it was all so wonderful then how come HDG himself protested?

MR's "comment" sidesteps the main issues, especially the texts attempting to relate Srila Prabhupada to child abuse. (It is difficult for me to write this, so disgusting is it that a so-called devotee could even think of such a thing, let alone want to make a study of it).

To give a comparison: some "scholars" have postulated that Jesus was a homosexual, or was intimately involved with Mary Magdalene, or had an Oedipus complex, or whatever. No serious Christian would discuss such a thing. If you start to think of Jesus like that, then the whole basis of your Christianity is demolished and you cease to be a Christian.

Faith, Srila Prabhupada wrote, means unflinching trust in something sublime. Prabhupada once said that if you lose faith in the guru, it is like a crack at the very foundation of your Krsna consciousness. To even to begin to think of connecting Srila Prabhupada to child abuse is profane and highly offensive.

Why do these things need to be spelled out? Isn't it obvious?

I refer you again to a text from Prithu Prabhu. Please read it carefully again. The first paragraph quoted is by MR, from a VAST posting.

>

> > We can't generalize from one case and say that it means that Prabhupada
> > does not share any blame for what happened to the youth. I'm not saying
> > that he is to blame, just that one instance (or even two or three) is
> > not enough data from which to draw that conclusion. We'd need much more
> > data, gathered in a scientifically acceptable way, to be able to make
> > general statements. And we are trying to remain academic here, right?

> > :-)

> >

> > Ys,

> > Madhusudani

>

>

> Note that she is calling for a so called academic presentation to show
> that Srila Prabhupada is not free from guilt as far as child abuse in
> ISKCON.

>

> According to scripture a self realized soul is free from the 4
> imperfections. What to speak of being party to child abuse.

>

> I vehemently protest the efforts of this person to drag Srila Prabhupada
> from his exalted position by this person.

>

> I propose herewith that Madhusudani Radhe be pulled up in front of a
> pannel and be censored.

> Instantly.

>

> If that does not make a difference and she continues her blasphemy of the
> Founder Acarya this person and so called disciple of such and such must be
> excommunicated from ISKCON.

>

Even if it is contended that the academic investigation (on whether or not Srila Prabhupada shares any blame for child abuse) is meant to answer the doubts of others, still it is offensive to propose that the acarya of the whole world be subject to our academic investigations.

What if the investigation were inconclusive, due to lack of evidence or whatever? Then you would have to make a report with the conclusion: "There does not exist an academic basis to absolve Srila Prabhupada from sharing any blame for child abuse."

I hope it is clear how anti-devotional this is.
(Text COM:2834889) -----

38. Shyamasundara dasa (astrologer) clarifies the history and specifics of discussion to Jayapataka Swami (note this letter was sent to JPS 5 times but he never responded).

Letter COM:2861537 (624 lines)
From: Shyamasundara (das) ACBSP (Sylva, NC - USA)
Date: 15-Dec-99 17:08 -0500
Reference: Text COM:2830102 by Jayapataka Swami (GBC)
Subject: Expelling Madhusudani Radha JPS

This is the second time I am sending this text. Could someone (Hari Sauri Prabhu, Sivarama Swami or the GBC EC Chairman) please forward to him to make sure he got it, we want to give him the benefit of the doubt that he has not read it yet. I will keep sending this text weekly until I get a response.

yhs
Shyamasundara Dasa

----- Forwarded Message -----

Letter COM:2837397 (605 lines)
From: Shyamasundara (das) ACBSP (Sylva, NC - USA)
Date: 07-Dec-99 03:33 -0500
Reference: Text COM:2830102 by Jayapataka Swami (GBC)
Subject: Expelling Madhusudani Radha JPS

Dear Jayapataka Swami,
Please accept my humble obeisances. All glories to Srila Prabhupada.
I hope that your Holiness will be kind to me and not become angry with me or curse me, your younger god-brother, for the following unpalatable strong points that I am going to make.

> > here is a comment by Madhusudani Radha
> > =====
> >
> > As you may already know, VAST is an academic conference, organized by
> > Brahma-tirtha Prabhu and Hridayananda Maharaja. It is set up for
> > devotees in academe to discuss the unique issues encountered there. The
> > reason this conference is not open to others is precisely because of
> > what happened after Syamasundara leaked these texts out of context, and
> > in violation of conference rules. Devotees in academe are challenged on
> > an almost daily basis and need a safe forum where they can discuss their
> > experiences.
>
> In reference to MRdd's comment and explanation could we have then a clear
> report on what statements are still considered offensive to Srila
> Prabhupada. What guidelines should be in place for this conference, or
> any conference, in regard to Srila Prabhupada.
>

We have sent umpteen texts from the VAST forum, and from the Topical Discussions forum as well as from Maria Ekstrand's web site. Every one else was disgusted by the contents, but you need more. Why? You are a disciple of Srila Prabhupada, you should be able to spot what everyone else found as

extremely offensive. As one of our God brothers in Canada, Kala Prabhu said **"after reading those texts I felt like committing suicide."** In any case I have provided several examples of the kind of offensive texts that she wrote in the body of this text. Please note them.

> I felt Syamasundara dasa was quoting things out of context and
> incompletely. However, I can give him the benefit of the doubt, but I
> cannot discuss with MRdd about her alleged "blasphemy" of Srila Prabhupada
> unless a very clear description of:

>

I am assuming that you are referring to the VAST texts that were sent.

1) I did not quote things out of context. I was not the author of the texts thus, can not be accused of the charges that you have made. Jivan Mukta Prabhu was the author.

2) Jivan Mukta Prabhu did not take the texts out of context.

3) The statement "quoting things out of context and incompletely" is your opinion and is not a fact. The burden of proof is on you to show that he took them out of context. If you cannot prove otherwise then you must accept it as true and hold your peace.

4) When "Ardhabuddhi Dasa" published "his" smear campaign in VNN attacking GHQ we not only said it was taken out of context, and stitched together for evil purposes, [we proved it to be so](#). This is one reason why the author of that diatribe chose to publish it under a pseudonym because they knew they would be exposed for the cheaters they were.

5) Jivan Mukta Prabhu published those VAST texts on VNN in his own name and stands behind them today just as he did when they were published in May 1999.

6) Those texts were published on VNN in May 1999, more than six months ago. Madhusudani Radha Devi Dasi, and company has had all that time to prove to the world that the texts were taken out of context and incomplete. She has not, even though she has her own web-site CHAKRA to publish it on.

7) Therefore, the texts in question are not taken out of context or incomplete and must be accepted as is, and you and everyone else should accept them. These texts plus the ones from Topical Discussions contain an over abundance of evidence proving guru-ninda by MRdd, Dhyanakunda dd and others.

>1) What was said that is considered objectionable and in what context?

You could not figure this out for yourself? We have to explain to you duhh!

>What is the explanation of the accused person?

As Bhakti Vikasa Swami said "Hariballabha doesn't think they are blaspheming. MR doesn't think she is blaspheming. Dhyanakunda doesn't think she is blaspheming." They are just engaging in free thinking and intellectual exploration of topical issues. Bogus.

>

> 2) whether it is considered a blasphemy, an impropriety, an offense or
> whatever and why it is so considered.

>

- > 4) What standards should there be for a devotee to accuse someone else of
- > being a blasphemer and thrown out of the movement to insure that we don't
- > "burn people at the stake" and have a proper Rule of Justice and Law.
- >
- > 5) What step by step remedial measures could be taken for correcting
- > improprieties or offenses rather than going immediately to expelling
- > someone.

>

- > If we have these in place then it will be easy enough to deal with any
- > circumstances that arise.

I shall take up point (3) separately.

I do not know if you read all the texts that have been sent to this group, or what texts you read. You have mentioned that you didn't read the texts I sent. There is a lot more here than just the VAST texts. The whole thing that started this was texts that came from the Topical Discussions Forum from last October 20th, a mere 7 weeks ago. In that forum moderated by MRdd, Dhyanakunda dd made many statements that have been almost universally condemned as offensive to Srila Prabhupada. This blasphemy of Srila Prabhupada was recognized by:

- 1) the second generation of disciples such as Nayana-ranjana, but more importantly for you, by your own disciples such as Vidvan Gauranga Prabhu, Bhadra Balarama and many others.
- 2) by our rank and file god brothers such as Kala Prabhu, Mahananda Prabhu and Vyapaka Prabhu.
- 3) by sannyasis, senior men and GBC men such as HH BB Govinda Swami, HH Bkakti Caru Swami, HH Guruprasada Swami, Prthu Prabhu, Hari Sauri prabhu and HH Sivarama Swami who reported it to the GBC discussions forum.

I say almost universally condemned because MRdd not only did not condemn Dhyanakunda dd for making such statements but urged that she be given the freedom to speak in this offensive way. She attacked devotees who tried to defend Srila Prabhupada and cut them off from speaking -- leaving air time only for offenders. Thus, MRdd is an accessory to the fact and in fact facilitates such offensiveness by providing a venue for spewing such poison. We don't need anything from her in her own words as JPS is demanding. Just the fact that she condoned, supported and facilitated such texts as the ones posted by DKdd on Topical Discussions are necessary and sufficient to prove her guilty. You did see those texts didn't you? If not I can send them to you. Please provide a code heading that I can put in the subject line so that they don't get lost in the ocean of your email.

It also seems that while it is universally recognized (even by your own disciples) that she is involved in offenses to Srila Prabhupada, you seem to be unable to recognize it and instead you seem to be giving her the benefit of the doubt and protect her in every instance. You are now forcing us to make intricate legalistic definitions of what constitutes an offense. By this track it will become like the Clinton Impeachment where debates go on the meaning of the word "is" or what exactly constitutes "sex." We see that by such legalistic maneuvers a man who was clearly guilty was found out to be innocent in the strictly legal definition. Why not give everyone else the benefit of the doubt? It would seem that Prthu Prabhu is correct, you are part of the problem and thus must share in the responsibility for her actions. As her guru, you already do, but by continuously coming to her defense it casts a worse light on your behavior. If this is going to be how the leadership of ISKCON deals with blatant offenses against Srila

Prabhupada then we should be prepared for massive defections of devotees who will want to distance themselves immediately so as not to partake of the karmic fallout which is bound to happen for tolerating and making excuses for such guru-ninda. I have already heard some GBCs state that they are prepared to resign rather than be part of a movement in which people like MRdd are prominent.

Regarding the "Laws of ISKCON" I am prepared to ignore them totally as

superfluous in this matter. The GBC picks and chooses when it wants to enforce a law and it makes laws it never enforces or simply changes the law to suit itself. Instead of that I say that we choose as our guideline guru-sadhu-sastra, Lord Krsna's law which is enforced by Lord Yamaraja, not Robert's Rules of Parliamentary Procedure. The assembled Brahmanas as mentioned above have already concluded that MRdd, DKdd and others are guilty of guru-ninda, why are you equivocating on this point?

If you want to go by ISKCON Law then the laws are already there. It is time to enforce them. There is no need to create more legalistic procedures as you have proposed. The brahmanas have spoken, she and others have been universally condemned for their actions, now is the time to execute the penalties for their offenses. As HH Bhakti Caru Swami said "My common sense says that anyone who blasphemes Srila Prabhupada, the Founder-Acarya of ISKCON, should be EXPELLED from ISKCON."

Prithu wrote:

>8.4.8.1

Offenses against Founder/Acarya and Guru Parampara

A person guilty of denouncing, openly blaspheming, or publicly abandoning loyalty to the Founder-Acarya; the previous Acaryas in the disciplic succession; or Lord Krishna, the Supreme Personality of Godhead, incurs automatic dissociation from ISKCON the right to revoke being reserved to the local Governing Body Commissioner. If the offending person holds a position of spiritual authority the right to revoke the dissociation is reserved to the Governing Body Commission. If the seriousness of the offense warrants a more severe reaction, other measures may be brought to bear, including dismissal from authority, disqualification for initiating, and excommunication.

8.4.8.2.

Offenses against the unity of ISKCON and the guru-parampara.

A person in a position of spiritual authority guilty of creating or attempting to create a schism in ISKCON, for example by culpable destruction of faith in the initiating spiritual master, the Guru-parampara, or the Governing Body Commission, incurs automatic suspension the right to revoke being reserved to the Governing Body Commission. If no rectification is forthcoming, other penalties may be added, including dismissal from spiritual authority and excommunication.

AS for the GBC body:

If the GBC does not even act to enforce ISKCON laws when it comes to vilifying Srila Prabhupada the members of the GBC were better off to resign and go into hiding.

Taking up point 3.

>3) If these issues come up in Academic or other circles and we have to defend outselve from these kind of criticisms then it what circle can it be

>discussed how to do so without risking being branded as a "blasphemer" in
>trying to find out a solution.

This is a completely bogus red herring. Madhusudani Radha, the princess of prevarication, would have us believe that what she was doing was simply an attempt to indulge in academic inquiry. And, like x-Hiranyagarbha who was actually "saving" Srila Prabhupada, MRdd was "saving" ISKCON from criticism in the academic world.

Srila Prabhupada related that once he had doubts about BSST regarding a time that BSST ordered that a snake be killed. Did Srila Prabhupada convene a discussion group to figure out how his guru, a supposed sadhu, could say such things. No. He had faith in BSST and continued his sadhana of reading and chanting and eventually his doubts were vanquished when he read in SB 7th canto how even saintly persons are delighted when a snake or scorpion is killed.

This issue of academic inquiry into "sexism" in Srila Prabhupada's books is only a issue because she makes it into one. I have worked with the Bhaktivedanta Institute off and on since 1978 and we never had any problems in dealing with academia on such issues. And, being a supporter of Sadaputa's work I know that we never pulled any punches in dealing with them. The difference between someone like Sadaputa Prabhu and MRdd is that Sadaputa Prabhu has complete, total and implicit faith in the words of Srila Prabhupada. He scrutinizingly studies the works of SP, and has a very good sadhana, etc. He is basically situated in the mode of goodness and has been very successful in preaching in academic circles without any of the problems which MRdd says are big issues. On the other hand we have MRdd whose consciousness is literally merged into the activities of demonic sodomites -- she is in completely in tama guna :

"That means tamo-guna, that the education-students, they are discussing about homosex. That means tamo-guna, lusty desires, very prominent, and how to fulfill, by homosex or sex with woman. This is their subject matter, kama" Morning Walk, May 11, 1975, Perth

So how can someone who is in tamo guna even remotely understand what Srila

Prabhupada is about? Let alone have an "academic" discussion about him? Let us take a look at the kind of academonic discussion MRdd has with her associates Dhyanakunada dd (DKdd) and Dvaipayana Vyasa dasa on the Topical Discussions forum. (I have sent you all the complete set of texts on Oct 20, 1998 if you didn't get a copy and want it let me know and I will send to you.)

In the following DKdd is describing how she doesn't trust Srila Prabhupada:

DKdd: I have singled out this example since it's a different kind of contradiction. Not a logical one but rather psychological. Prabhupada first exhibits a very negative attitude toward one Richard, and a few sentences later, he becomes quite positive about him and sees good qualities in him. What has changed?

DKdd: This kind is what bothers me, personally, perhaps more than the simpler kinds. **I just have a big problem trusting persons who label others so

easily and so unpredictably.**

Then DKdd lists other things about Srila Prabhupada that bother her:

Dkdd: Another things that bothers me is that Srila Prabhupada is always so sure of himself. He is fully confident in his own judgment. He is fully confident that the world is full of girls, that in certain places all people are rascals, that "Bad things means Western type of civilization," etc. Very strong, super simple black-and-white general statements. Where ordinary people would soften their statements by saying, "as far as I know," "I am convinced that," "to some degree," "in this respect," "from my experience," "most probably," "at present it looks like..." etc., Srila Prabhupada passes absolute judgments, and he is not even consistent in them.

Dkdd: I am ready to believe the source of his certainty is direct link with Krsna's absolute knowledge, *if* it can be proven he was absolutely right each time.

Dkdd: Up till then, I will rather suppose Prabhupada's absolute self-confidence was a feature of his own individual character.

Reacting to these obviously unacademic but rather very offensive statements

Mahanada Prabhu complains to the moderator of the Topical Discussion forum namely Madhusudani Radha dd. In a text which she inadvertently be let seen by the public she says the following about Mahananda Prabhu:

MRdd: Just wanted to let you both [DKdd and Dvaipayana Vyasa] know that I'm going to make Mahananda "distrusted".[this is a COM command which does not allow Mahananda's texts to reach the forum.] His constant threats and put downs are getting old and he's received plenty of warnings. Below he is threatening Dhy with ISKCON sanctions *and* manages to put her down "poor girl" in one fell swoop. It's obvious that this is not the correct forum for him. I guess he'll still be able to have these discussions on com.org, but at least he won't be able to intimidate the bbt.se members. Texts like his can have a chilling effect on free speech.

Yes, it is okay for DKdd to say all kinds of disgusting things about SP. Do you Jayapataka Swami, think that what DKdd said about SP was okay? Mahananda Prabhu didn't, neither do I or any other sincere disciple or grand-disciple. This is what MRdd wants to convince you is legitimate academic inquiry. Do you agree to this?

Continuing. Now MRdd is replying to a letter by Mahananda Prabhu who is vigorously complaining to the way DKdd has characterized SP. See how MRdd stifles him and supports DKdd's depiction of SP. And, what is that depiction that MRdd supports, that Srila Prabhupada is "more of a human being and less 'God-like'" and "that he has made mistakes about material matters" (specifically in his views on women no doubt) , i.e. conditioned by the modes of material nature and thus subject to the four defects. Whereas, a very sweet, simple and humble devotee like Mahananda Prabhu sees SP as "god-like." Why? Because, while SP is not God he is the bona fide representative of Lord Krsna and thus worthy of all respect and treatment

that is due to an emissary of God. This is the Vaisnava siddhanta. MRdd rejects it and calls anyone who complains against her as trying to impede genuine academic inquiry. She is a demoness and must be expelled along with her followers. Or, do you, JPS, think that MRdd is also entitled to her views of SP just as she is to her (wrong) choice of how to address Vaisnavis?

Then MRdd accuses Mahananda that it is his subjective opinion to accuse them of blasphemy while actually they are just trying to have a forum where they can discuss their (mis-)understandings with each other. Mahanada Prabhu was absolutely right according to sastra to accuse and condemn her of the most serious type of guru-ninda. I repeat this woman is a demoness and must be EXPELLED. Here is the text. My comments in []

Mahananda's text is prefixed by ">"

> I request that devotees that think that this permissive attitude that allows
>this blatant depicting of our founding acarya is such an offensive light--
>write to the overseers of COM itself, in the hopes that bringing it to their
>attention will end this great slap in our beloved guru's face. To hear from
>several devotees in protest will get their attention.

MRdd: This is a threat

>

>I am afraid the poor girl

MRdd: Dhyanakunda Prabhu is a grown woman. Don't belittle her. (this is not necessarily a rule violation, just wanted to let you know)

>

>I am afraid the poor girl who was concerned that her postings getting out to
>the wrong persons is going to realize her worst fears because these words,
>now posted publicly about our beloved master, may very well become the topic
>of concern in many quarters of our movement,
>regretfully, Mahananda dasa

MRdd: This is an intimidation attempt.

MRdd: Taken together with your many recent texts in which you have put down or threatened other members (telling them they're offensive, that they're ruining their spiritual lives, requesting others not to associate with them etc), your position is becoming very clear. [yes it is clear that he is a sincere vaisnava---Shyama] You can not tolerate other people's having opinions that are different from yours or their using their own brains. You do not even want them to have a forum or voice where they can discuss their understanding with each other. This is called intolerance.

MRdd: Although other people may see Prabhupada as more of a human being and less "God-like" than you do and they may feel that he has made mistakes about material matters, without feeling that this detracts from his ability to give us Krsna, *you* have taken it upon yourself to judge that this constitutes an offense, that your view of Prabhupada is the only right one and that everyone else is a blasphemer.

[There can be no room in ISKCON for two views of Srila Prabhupada. Those who hold MRdd's view of SP must go out of ISKCON. There they are free to have

whatever view they want.]

MRdd: Regretfully, you leave me no other option but to remove you from this conference. You have received numerous warnings and been given the benefit of the doubt more times than any other member. You know what the conference rules are, and in spite of your assurances to the contrary, it appears obvious that you have no intention of following them. It's obvious that this is not an appropriate forum for you. Fortunately, there are many other forums where you will feel more comfortable. Best wishes.

In this next text MRdd again shows what her views are of SP, that he is mundane. How did she come to such conclusions? Is this the way you have trained your disciples? Dear JPS the whole of ISKCON would like to know if you agree with MRdd's statements below? (I find them totally repulsive.) If you don't agree why have you not properly trained her by:

- 1) ordering her to leave her demonic association and get another job not working with demons.
- 2) Encouraging her to study SP's books and humbly imbibe Vedic culture as opposed to trying to spread the malignancy of feminism (which is homo-philic) into ISKCON

Mahananda ">"

>I do follow the rules. If you don't like me then remove me if you are so
>wanting to. No where have I insulted anyone or put any one down.

MRdd: Sorry, I disagree and just sent you a text informing you of such examples and of your removal.

> If you do not want me there, just tell me. No hard feelings.

MRdd: I do want you there, but without the threats and put downs. You do have something to contribute and your literalism is a welcome viewpoint (but it's not the only one). So is your deification of Prabhupada. But it's equally acceptable for some to see Prabhupada as an empowered human being who made some material mistakes but who nevertheless is able to give us Krsna. Maybe you can rejoin after a cool-down break?
[end of quote.]

You asked "then it what circle can it be discussed how to do so without risking being branded as a 'blasphemer' in trying to find out a solution."
As you well know the Vaisnava tradition is not against intelligent inquiry contrary to what the princess of prevarication would have us believe. To this end I have including an illuminating essay by your own disciple Vidvan Gauranga Prabhu who has explained the method of Vedic intellectual inquiry and accurately analyzed all the faults in the arguments of DKdd and MRdd and concluded that they are "trash."

In conclusion there can be no doubt that Maria Ekstrand (she is not worthy of being addressed as a vaisnavi) and her followers are guilty of aiding and abetting the spread of guru aparadha in ISKCON and must be expelled ASAP.

Yhs
Shyamasundara Dasa

[The essay has been left out for the sake of brevity but can be found at
<http://ghqd.org/articles/History%20of%20blasphemy.htm>]

39. Sivarama Swami expressing frustration at the lack of practical action in regards to offensive statements against Srila Prabhupada on COM

Letter COM:2837508 (26 lines)
From: Sivarama Swami
Date: 07-Dec-99 04:13 -0500
Subject: On closing all COM etc

Dear Mr Chairman

Perhaps I can shed light on the frustration of myself and other GBC members regarding the offensive statements in VAST and elsewhere regarding Srila Prabhupada.

1. When the "Vrndavana" issue came out the GBC Exec was quick to give an immediate public response to whatever they saw the issue to be.

2. Although I and others, have requested some action since the 21st of October, 7 weeks, not even a Stay Order, like

a) All discussions regarding Srila Prabhupada's "sexist" views should stop in com conferences.

b) "Offensive statements" (or any that can be construed to be so) regarding Srila Prabhupada are not tolerated in ISKCON or in any ISKCOM forum.

c) etc etc

has been issued, which may not have been accurate but would have assuaged those concerned parties that something was being done.

3). Although a series of recommendations have been given since, little communication has returned to the concerned parties, other than JPS's reluctant agreement to talk with MRdd

Therefore I and others remain unhappy that the seriousness of this issue has been recognized and is being dealt with expeditiously.

(Text COM:2837508) -----

40. Bhakti Vikasa Swami defines proper mood in which to study Srila Prabhupada's teachings

Letter COM:2843138 (13 lines)
From: Bhakti Vikasa Swami
Date: 09-Dec-99 01:23 -0500

I'm not against using intelligence to understand Srila Prabhupada. It is true, for instance, that the hasty manner in which Srila Prabhupada's books were published led to many oversights. There is even a com conf for editors and translators called "Errors in Srila Prabhupada's Books." And it is certainly worth discussing how to present the message of Srila Prabhupada to the academia in the age of feminism, considering that Srila Prabhupada was staunchly anti-feminist.

Such endeavors are not inherently offensive. However, the manner and attitude with which they are undertaken need to be assessed. Statements such as "I come to save Prabhupada", "I cannot trust him", "sexist" etc. are

clearly offensive. As are attempts to link, or even de-link, His Divine Grace with child abuse, "spiritual abuse" etc.
(Text COM:2843138) -----

41. Jayapataka Swami continues to defend MRdd

Letter COM:2847888 (68 lines)
From: Jayapataka Swami (GBC)
Date: 10-Dec-99 18:31 -0500
Subject: on closing all COM conferences

> > You should check the German forum and see if they are actually
> > > blaspheming Srila Prabhupada or not. At least the organizer
> > > Hariballabha doesn't think so, and she says the recent criticism was a
> > > chance to discuss and come to a favorable conclusion.
>
> Hariballabha doesn't think they are blaspheming. MR doesn't think she is
> blaspheming. Dhyanakunda doesn't think she is blaspheming.

This is true. MRdd wrote to me as follows:

> However, if they're hell-bent on trying to ruin my reputation, they
> will find a way to sling mud. Isn't there any way in which ISKCON can
> establish procedures for complaints, so that this can't happen again
> and again and again. I feel like I've been answering the same
> charges unpteen times, e.g the VAST texts are almost two years old
> and I have explained more times than I can remember on multiple
> conferences that the discussion re. whether Prabhupada's books should
> be footnoted was only for academic settings. I have also stated
> numerous times that the final conclusion was that we were *not* going
> to propose this, but instead let devotee scholars write their own
> books. In spite of this, I just saw a text by Prthu written
> yesterday, in which he accused me of wanting to footnote Prabhupada's
> books. I felt like pulling my hair out. I don't know how to get
> through to people who don't want to listen and who already have their
> minds made up.

We have many Laws about how people will be punished or disciplined for blaspheming, for canvassing, for so many things. Some clear definition what blasphemy is should also be given. If in discussion someone says something which is offensive, not with an intent to blaspheme, but due to immaturity in understanding Krishna conscious etiquette or any other non vindictive reason---then does that construe "blasphemy"? It might be an offense and if so need to be corrected. If anytime someone makes an error they are blasted and calls for expulsion are given then how many people will we eventually lose from ISKCON?

Srila Prabhupada wanted a Rule of Law. Why not put up some practical proposal for a code of what is unacceptable for posting in a COM conference. This could be accepted by the GBC and BBT and all this ongoing discussion without end could be concluded with a favorable ending for all.

If MRdd is correct and these texts are from two years ago (TWO YEARS!!!!) then isn't somewhat strange that they are being repeated again and again even now. My understanding is repeating an offensive statement again and again is also offensive. How would anyone feel if someone said that Sri YXX dasa has committed an offense against Srila ABCDEFG Swami by wrongly saying he was having illicit sex and dealing in pornography. That goes on being

repeated again and again ostentatiously to complain against Sri XYZ dasa, but in doing so Srila ABCDEFG Swami is having his name repeatedly dragged in the dirt. Rather than repeating again and again statements from two years ago for the next decade which someone found offensive against Srila Prabhupada thus putting out more and more potentially offensive vibrations against Srila Prabhupada. A clear cut policy on how complaints of misconduct on a COM conference (that seems to be the original point of this lengthy tree of discussion) be made and a system for judicially hearing complaints. If some statement is found guilty of exceeding whatever limits are set the text should be erased and a statement withdrawing it and apologizing from the perpetrator should be published. FINISHED! Then lets get on with life!

If someone is a repeated offender then his/her rights to be on COM could be suspended for some shortg time. If still they are doing after being suspended once then they could be removed. Lets do something practical now and not waste more time going around and around a merry-go-round.

Your servant,
Jayapataka Swami

(Text COM:2847888) -----

42. Chairman of GBC Executive Committee not allowed to close COM conferences

Letter COM:2857943 (21 lines) [W1]

From: Bir Krishna das Goswami

Date: 14-Dec-99 13:05 -0500

Subject: What about this one?

·>> We ought to wake up and understand that the internet is real. It's
>> probably not going to disappear in forseeable future. It's
·>> hyper-anarchistic, it's dangerous, it's everywhere. And still, it can be
·>> used to spread Krishna consciousness.
·>
·>I have to agree with this. We can't prevent people from speaking, nor is
·>it desirable to do so. However, we can keep a modicum of sanity on our own
·>conferences by having suitable monitors and I think we should aim for
·>this.

This is not possible with the present level of staffing when you have hundreds of conferences.

You have several options which include:

1. Closing down all public conferences
2. Severely limiting the number of public conferences
3. Appointing 5-10 people whose only service is to monitor the conferences.
4. Shutting com down completely.

Previously I tried to close down all public conferences but was not allowed to do so.

(Text COM:2857943) -----

43. Prithu dasa empahsizes that there will be a price to pay for tolerating such blasphemous remarks. We are increasingly being controlled by software. And by those who know to use it in their favor.

Letter COM:2858354 (83 lines)

From: Prithu (das) ACBSP

Date: 14-Dec-99 15:47 -0500

Subject: HELP !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

-
- > We ought to wake up and understand that the internet is real. It's
 - > probably not going to disappear in foreseeable future. It's
 - > hyper-anarchistic, it's dangerous, it's everywhere. And still, it can
 - > be used to spread Krishna consciousness.

Naturally one cannot stop people from climbing on their soapboxes, mailing out their messages to whoever they want to.
That does not even bother me.

However:

As for Com it is definitely within our domain, ability and as such responsibility to see that its members are observant of (Vaishnava) etiquette and its conferences are being properly conducted (if needed moderated) just like any government, any corporation or church would do.

In fact WinCOM software provides for a responsible moderator of a conference to pre-view every single message before it hits the fan, regardless whether that message originates from a subscriber to that conference or is a message coming in from outside our jurisdiction, the Internet.

Since we do have the means to control the contents of our conferences it is our responsibility to keep our system as much as conferences clear of offences.

If we don't: we share no doubt every bit of the karma to offences being committed.

As we seem to be unwilling at this stage to take serious action, even the responsibility for what is said within our domain, ISKCON leadership as much as Com authorities--due to a variety of reasons, ranging from indecisiveness via procrastination to amnesia- if not worse--with exception of the few who try their level best to stop this tragedy of blaspheming or undermining Srila Prabhupada's authority, has become party to and is hence guilty of the worst of Vaishnava aparadha - guru aparadha - ever committed in ISKCON, on a magnitude which makes offenders of the past such as Hansadutta and Bhagavan look like Saints and Sages.

We will not be able to escape judgment--neither from above nor from a 'whole world watching', by hiding behind the trappings accompanying modern society, such as "free speech", liberalism or whatever.

We will have to pay a high price for our willingness to accommodate a relatively confined but highly vocal cyber sect of radical activists within our communication system, who are enthusiastic to re-evaluate and re-imagine SrilaPrabhupada, re-define his teachings, re-configure and re-invent Krishna Consciousness, now and according to every turn in social experience and cultural shift still to come.

In this battle for the minds those who do attend no morning programs, don't chant 16 rounds, have the worst sadhana and perform the least devotional service in terms of hearing, chanting, worshiping the deity, associating with devotees and performing devotional service under the guidance of Srila Prabhupada, in other words those with the least spiritual merits are favored the most as they have all the time to surf the net all day to hop from conference to conference, instantly be hailed as new Messiahs and offered the seat of the speaker.

It makes no sense even by ordinary standards.
It's totally unthinkable by Vaishnava tradition.

In fact it has not even to do with the so-called 'real' world, where 'real' persons meet 'real' persons to talk to each other, in consideration to degree of responsibility and merits, under the protocol of Vaishnava etiquette.

It has to do with virtual-reality bulls**t.

Simply by the click of a mouse one can whimsically assemble a large audience of listeners, pull a person up in front of all and against his will, and drag him through the gutters. Or hitch a ride with somebody sympathetic to one's cause right into the (virtual) GBC conference room to make your presentation, forcing everyone to put all things aside to listen to one's great ideas how to run the International Society for Krishna Consciousness.

This stuff is not what we are supposed to be involved with.

It has to do with impersonalism, with ruin to all human relationships as much as Vaishnava conventions.

We are increasingly being controlled by software.

And by those who know to use it in their favor.

yspda
(Text COM:2858354) -----

44. Hari Sauri dasa urges to stop these messages which are contaminating many devotees

Letter COM:2861185 (33 lines) [W1]
From: Hari Sauri (das) ACBSP
Date: 15-Dec-99 19:58 -0500

Subject: Reply to Bharata Srestha and members of VAST

> q·>to various proceedings of judgment. But my concern is that this COM
> q·>medium, by its very nature, gives everything else but the benefit of the> q·>doubt where indeed there may
be a trace of reason to believe that
> someone q·>who has spent years of sincere service to Srila Prabhupada and
> his Society q·>might still sincerely desire to continue to serve. Is this
> method of q·>stamping out the fire of heresy not going to also put out many
> sparks of q·>desire to serve Krsna in the process, sparks which we should
> be carefully q·>fanning into stronger flames?
> q·>
>
> Exactly my point. That is why I am not participating in this discussion.
> We see black and white but we aren't concerned with helping the person who
> may be expressing their doubts.
>
> This medium is not the medium to deal with such things. This medium
> exacerbates the problem with rabble-rousing crowd pleasing energy.

An equally so, this medium affords people the opportunity to exacerbate their offensive mentality to many others. Non participation merely allows the problem to go on, and indeed, will see it grow. To hear

blasphemy, to allow it to go on, is the same as doing it.

By all means help people who need help. And by all means prevent them from spreading their lack of sraddha to hundreds or thousands of innocent persons through a mass media vehicle like COM. We cannot take this criticism of Srila Prabhupada so lightly, that in the name of being heavy with one or two persons who are having difficulty, we have to allow them to contaminate the consciousness of hundreds. Limit them and deal personally with them about their problems. People with severe doubts should be dealt with in isolation.

Your humble servant,

Hari-sauri dasa

(Text COM:2861185) -----

45. Prithu dasa emphasizes need for specific action and quotes Raktambara dasa (COM Sysop) that the BBT is in charge of COM

Letter COM:2864630 (118 lines)

From: Prithu (das) ACBSP

Date: 17-Dec-99 03:59 -0500

Subject: how to save ourselves from the offences committed to Srila Prabhupada

Bir Krishna Maharaja said:

> But this screaming, yelling, demonising and demanding blood on the internet
> is not the proper procedure. I will have nothing to do with it. It is not
> proper.

With the same sympathetic eye we are willing to look at those who have offended or participated to offend Srila Prabhupada we should look at those who have been vehemently protesting.

The devotees who have committed the offences are in court, and not the witnesses, regardless how intense their protest.

Especially as all the protest was really just a reaction to the fact that nothing much has accomplished by the GBC to stop the offences of minimizing Srila Prabhupada, by certain individual or in certain conferences.

To say that those who have protested look bad seems to lead away from the fact that those who did not sufficiently try to stop the scandal, that SP has been offended on COM have egg over their face.

I appreciate that to take control of the situation was not an easy thing to do. It was by no means clear, who actually controls and is as such responsible for the ISKCON section of the COM.

Here is some news in this direction.

Brahma Muhurta Prabhu wrote:

13-Dec-99 / 00:43 +0100, Letter COM:2851929

> I cannot but see COM as a utility. When a BBT devotee misuses the
> utility, the BBT takes care of that. When an ISKCON devotee misuses it,
> ISKCON must do something about it. It's as simple as that.

My reply was:

13-Dec-99 07:03 +0100 / Letter COM:285378

I would like to hear from Rakatambara and Mother Mukhya dd if that's fine with them...

Raktambara Prabhu answer came promptly, the same day:

13-Dec-99 22:37 +0100 / Text COM:2855806

"It is entirely up to the BBT to decide on its policies."

Your servant,
Raktambara das

With Brahma's message on the table, see above, it is at least from this point on not the BBT's business but our business.

Hence from this point on the responsibility to move and take control of the ISKCON section of COM is clearly in the hands of the GBC.

That is since Dec 13th.

May I present some proposals to the listening in Vaishnava:

First of all I suggest that we should address the issue of the offences which have been committed to Srila Prabhupada. It is not hard to provide for documentation.

Those who committed offences by criticizing Srila Prabhupada or allowing criticism to be voiced in their conferences should publicly apologize.

If they do, let's have kirtan.

If they don't, their COM account should be closed.

Next, as for the Future of COM:

We should put a GBC Commission into place to regulate COM.

To assure a good result and avoid that just a couple of wrists will be slapped, this commission should include some of the devotees who were at the forefront to voice their concerns over the last so many months.

As there are a whole group of responsible personalities listening to this string, we might as well ask the present participants to make proposals as to who could sit on this Commission.

I can think of Bir Krishna Maharaja, Sivarama Maharaja, Trivikrama Maharaja, Ravindra Svarupa Prabhu, Badri Narayana Prabhu, Hari Sauri and Sivarama. (I admit, if I would be proposed to be a member of this commission I would not say no.)

Plus Syamasundara Prabhu - I think it's unfair to minimise someone who was crying out for help to all of us that Srila Prabhupada has been offended.

He has done more research than all of us and as such he is a valuable resource. Plus some of our deputies.

This commission should develop firm policies as for the ISKCON section of the COM system.

By Mayapur latest we should be able to come to some clear ideas which then can

be voted upon by the GBC body.

To give us a breathing space, those conferences in which Srila Prabhupada was offended (it's really not so hard to make a list of them) should be suspended up to the Mayapur meetings and their air traffic should be examined.

Up to Mayapur we then have plenty of time to discuss what we should do with these conferences.

Keep but put on notice the moderators, replace the moderators, close these conferences or restrict the ISKCON section the way the BBT does as for its own section - as a communication system with conferences entirely dedicated to manage ISKCON and ISKCON affairs.

Further:

the moderators of the conferences in question should be approached and moved to apologize, take their hat and resign voluntarily.

Even just to save them from the offence to have allowed that Srila Prabhupada was offended in their domain.

Only if we take serious steps in regard to COM, we can save ourselves from the reactions of offences committed to Srila Prabhupada.

Even just by procrastination, fence sitting, or whatever.

yspda

(Text COM:2864630) -----

46. Jayapataka Swami opines that Mrdd isn't the problem and suggests specific action to improve COM situation

Letter COM:2874280 (184 lines)

From: Jayapataka Swami (GBC)

Date: 21-Dec-99 04:42 -0500

Subject: Reply to JPS

> > >

> > > "I had all my students read one of Prabhupada's little books and they
> > > hated the sexist statements"

> >

> > Saying that one's students hated sexist statements is different then

> > saying that Srila Prabhupada's books are sexist.

>

> To say that Srila Prabhupada's books have sexist statements in them means

> to say they are sexist. To contend otherwise is simply hair splitting.

I don't think it is hair splitting. It depends on what your definition of sexist is. If using his/him/he is considered sexist, for instance?

Also this is a statement of a student, not a devotee. A student read the books and felt some statements were sexist. Not that the whole book was sexist. They didn't say they hated the book, but they hated the sexist statements. Now that needs some preaching. From our point of view we don't feel things are sexist. We need to communicate that to those who do think they are so that we can save those persons from making offenses. Apart from that if a group of academicians are discussing this topic and one made this statement to the others on how some students felt and how to deal with their perception that there are sexist statements in Srila Prabhupada's books, then what is wrong with that? Sooner or later all the preachers are going to have to come with grips that a lot of things that Srila Prabhupada said are not PC by current opinion and we need to be able to explain it and defend it. Some things are quoted from Srila Prabhupada which

certainly he never intended to be published. They were confidential comments made to certain individuals, but now they are published in Folio. So we do need to address these issues and come out with Krishna conscious statements. Just like the Pope isn't popular for going against illicit sex and abortion, but still he sticks to his point of view. We need to discuss issues and clearly arrive at as close a thing to a consensus as possible as to what is our point of view and then stand behind it and preach it. I see this as a major work for the GBC and senior devotees to do. Since we aren't doing it then it is happening in back room COM conferences.

> > it was published on VNN. NOt exactly the place GBC members go for
> > their mail.

> Jivan Mukta dasa has written to you personally on related issues but you
> didn't reply. How does a "rank and file" devotee go about communicating
> with the GBC or a GBC member? Especially on issues they want to ignore?
> I'm experiencing right on this thread being ignored by the chairman of the
> EC with important and pressing questions. Another sannyasi/GBC has
> expressed the same thing to me:

I don't know of any letter to me from Jivan Mukta dasa, nor do I know personally Jivan Mukta dasa, nor am I specifically obliged to respond to every letter that anyone writes me on the internet if I actually recieved it. I get tons of mail every day and it isn't humanly possible for me to respond to everything that is written. Still if I had gotten a personal letter from an ISKCON member I would try to reply to it eventually. It is easy to ignore things on COM and internet when we are so much overloaded with information. The actual procedure Srila Prabhupada gave us to deal with things is to write up a proposal and have it submitted through a GBC member and then it is taken up as a business. I have come a millimeter many times from ejecting myself from this thread since I don't see what productive end is being sought here. I see the solution as really simple.

- 1) Make some standards for COM and its different kinds of conferences.
- 2) Make some way of enforcing and insuring that standards are followed.
- 3) Have senior responsible persons as organizers and members of conferences who are responsible for insuring proper adherence to standards.
- 4) Discipline persons who do not follow COM Rules by excluding them for periods of time, or give them points like on your driving license.
- 5) Also take disciplinary action against persons who don't follow the prescribed method for addressing transgressions on COM.

> >

> > BKG hasn't replied to any of our suggestions. Perhaps it is "politically
> > incorrect" for him to do so.

>

> The same sannyasi/GBC continued:

>

> > Recently a solid GBC man told me that this was the thing that could
> > cause him to pack up and leave ISKCON ... that MRD and her group were to
> > have unbridled influence in ISKCON.

It is highly provocative and faith shattering to hear that a "solid GBC" man is saying he would "pack up and leave ISKCON" for anything. The GBC should wake up then and start to take the bridle of really protecting the purity of ISKCON in a very appropriate manner. Just kicking the ball around on this thread isn't producing anything but an increase in bile fluids and maybe reactions for offenses.

ISKCON leaders need to avoid grouping people and lumping them in with

statements like "MRD and her group". It is just not an appropriate way of referring to people. There may be things you like or don't like about something that some thinks or does, but all ISKCON members and devotees should be given basic respect and courtesy even if they have different beliefs. Didn't Srila Prabhupada say in dealing with areas we see as deviations: "hate the disease and not the diseased". I don't like having people branded as this is some very dangerous tendency.

>

> I know who that GBC man is because he told me the same thing.

>

> > So I've opened the communication link (which, by the way, was always
> > open for anyone to discuss with her) and any specific concerns could be
> > clearly stated and sent to me and I will take up the matter with MRdd.
> > I would appreciate if not only the quote was sent, but the context in
> > which the statement was made. Also please give a short paragraph why
> > you feel it is offensive.

>

> This sounds like arguing with ritviks. They say: "Show the evidence." You
> show stacks of it, then they do some word jugglery to supposedly
> invalidate it, and again they say, "You haven't shown any evidence."

>

> There has been ample evidence sent to you linking MRdd to statements about
> Srila Prabhupada and child abuse, sexism and so-called spiritual abuse.
> Although you don't see what other GBC men see as horribly offensive,
> several GBC men are very upset, and are demanding action. Even BKG (after
> much prodding) agreed that something has to be done. It was deferred until
> you spoke to her. Now the time is over.

Well I also sent back her statements explaining what happened, explaining how she didn't have any intention of offending Srila Prabhupada, and many other things. You haven't specifically addressed anything she said nor do you accept her explanation. Simply branding someone as an offender, appealing to banish someone and doing a witch hunt doesn't seem to be a constructive means of resolving the problems.

I was also upset to hear that some of the quotes are from two years ago, from a private conference of university related persons, taken out of context and broadcasted widely by the so-called champions of truth.

If someone privately voices a doubt and then gets preached to about it is that wrong? Or is it wrong to publicly shout to everyone the doubtful statements about Srila Prabhupada in the name of stopping offenses? If someone asked me something negative about you and i preached to the person how it couldn't be true is that wrong or is it wrong if then I would put out on VNN, Chakra, COM, etc., etc. the persons doubts to say how the person was offensive. ACTually I would simply be spreading bad news about you.

Srila Prabhupada personally advised me that this was a kind of technique to making offenses against vaisnavas and looking innocent. The Gaudiya Math would use this technique against Srila Prabhupada in his presence and he was very upset about it. Now our so-called loyal people are doing the same. So I think this whole this is really an over-reaction and being handled very unprofessionally. What is happening is more offenses against Srila Prabhupada are being inadvertently made in the name of stopping offenses. Make the standards I proposed above. If you like the proposal then any two GBC men can second it and it can be accepted as a formal proposal. Of course we should hope the BBT would accept our final standards, but I don't think there should be a big problem with that.

> Or is it, as another GBC wrote to me, that
>
> > If you let something lie for long enough, the hope is that people
> > will forget it.

Instead of just a lot of hot air steaming off I would like to see some practical steps taken. I was asked to communicate with my disiple and I did so. I reported her explanation to this conference. I didn't get any substantial response to her statements. I fail to see what is gained if someone maintains a humble attitude and says they won't want to offend Srila Prabhupada and are willing to follow whatever standard is made on COM that why we should go on smashing the person on the head. Just make the standards and enforce them. Finished. You may all have time to sit and read these texts for days and weeks and months, but I frankly am over-stretched and don't have the time. I, like all of you, want to see action. I don't see expulsion or something like that as an appropriate action in this case, but establishing some standards for COM certainly seems a need of the hour. I am sorry if I have dissatisfied any of you, but I am trying to be very open, honest and truthful about what I have picked up.

In all the texts I have only seen one or two quotes repeated umpteen times and I haven't seen some consistent history of anti-Srila Prabhupada discussions. MRdd reads Srila Prabhupada's books, works in Srila Prabhupada's movement, just like all of you do. She is spiritually a younger devotee and may need to be guided from time to time. I hope you will treat her in that considerate manner. I have asked that if anyone has any specific points that I haven't written to her about then send to me and I will be happy to do whatever I can to insure that she doesn't get intangled in any vaisnava aparadha as it is my specific duty to see she gets back to Godhead as it is also all of yours general responsibility to see that all ISKCON devotees get back to Lord Sri Krishna.

Your servant,

Jayapataka Swami

(Text COM:2874280) -----

47. Sivarama Swami resigns from GBC Body

From: Sivarama Swami
Subject: My resignation from the GBC

Dear Chairman and Executive
Please accept my humble obeisances. All glories to Srila Prabhupada

I am sorry to have to tender my resignation from the GBC body. I am not happy to do so but see no alternative at present.

For the last two months I and many others have been concerned over blasphemous statements made by some members of our Society (and member outside of our Society on ISKCON's communications media COM) about Srila Prabhupada. The GBC executive or body has not to date stopped such criticism nor taken a clear and strong stance against it.

According to sastra there are three steps to take in such circumstances.
Cut out the offender's tongue - I cannot do that, defeat them with argument
- that cannot be done over com and takes time, or leave the vicinity - that

is the only recourse left; therefore I resign.

I recognize that there should be a due process for addressing the pro's and con's of the issue, and communicating with the perpetrators in a vaisnava way. My objection is to the lack of response by the GBC in supporting an inviolable principle, "Srila Prabhupada cannot be minimized in ISKCON" and taking some interim steps until the entire issue is finally resolved.

I must voice my most serious objection to this inaction, which I see as defacto support of the blasphemy of Prabhupada.

I shall continue to act as caretaker for this zone and the devotees therein (eg. as regional secretary). When this issue has been clearly dealt with, the GBC body may consider if they want me to resume my duties as a member. Until then I remain...

Your servant
Sivarama Swami

48. Bhakti Caru Swami resigns from GBC Body

Text COM:2973283 (175 lines)
From: Bhakti Caru Swami
Date: 31-Jan-00 06:20 +0530
To: GBC Discussions [9421]
Subject: My resignation from the GBC

I agree with Ameyatma Prabhu and feel extremely embarrassed being a party to the plot that he is addressing here. I should have considered the matter a little more deeply before pronouncing my praises about Madhusudani Radha dd. As a matter of fact a couple of months back I voiced my concern about this issue in the com after receiving a letter from Shyamasundar Prabhu. And when Jayapataka Maharaj mentioned that she apologized for her mistake I felt satisfied and decided to drop the issue. However, now I can see that that apology was not real.

I don't know Ameyatma Prabhu personally. nevertheless, I hear his voice as the echo of the helpless cry of many sincere followers of Srila Prabhupada. I feel extremely regretful about my inability to do anything to defend Srila Prabhupada's honor and protect his ISKCON. Therefore, I hereby submit my resignation from the GBC as one of its members.

Your humble servant,
Bhakti Caru Swami.

>

(Text COM:2973283) -----

49. Excerpts from an announcement by Raktambara dasa (COM Sysop) that COM has now been leased from the BBT and is no longer under the control of the GBC

Text COM:2980249 (107 lines) [W1]
From: Raktambara (das) (SysOp)
Date: 02-Feb-00 05:09 -0500
To: (COM) System (Info) [251]
To: system@pronto.bbt.se (sent: 02-Feb-00 05:16 -0500)
Subject: PLEASE READ - The Bhaktivedanta E-mail Services

Dear COM & PRONTO users,

Please accept our humble obeisances.
All glories to Srila Prabhupada.

From February 1, 2000 onwards, the North European BBT (NE BBT) leases its e-mail infrastructure (previously known as The BBT E-mail Systems) to their respective System Operators (SysOps), who run it as the Bhaktivedanta E-mail Services. The SysOps maintain the system in all aspects, and define its policies.

In other words, although the NE BBT is the owner of the infrastructure, the NE BBT is not managing or governing The Bhaktivedanta E-mail Services (see note 1)....

Your servants at the Bhaktivedanta E-mail Services,

Raktambara das, Mukhya devi dasi,
Ramakanta das

NOTES

Note 1:

Another point, which is somewhat related: The Bhaktivedanta E-mail Services are on friendly terms with ISKCON, but are not a part of it. Therefore, The Bhaktivedanta E-mail Services are not governed by the ISKCON Governing Body Commission.

Our facilitating the GBC on our mail network has been interpreted by some GBC members as our being subjected to the GBC. This is an unfortunate misunderstanding. Until further notice, we are on friendly terms with but independent from the ISKCON GBC. (Our infrastructure provider, the BBT, is also -- by Srila Prabhupada's direct instruction -- separate from ISKCON and

independent from the management of the GBC.)

Copyright ©© 2000 The Bhaktivedanta E-mail Services

(Text COM:2980249) -----

50. Ameyatma dasa responding (and quoting) to an email from Madhusudani Radha d.d.

From: "Ameyatma.ACBSP"

MRdd> Please send me an example of a text in which you think I belittle
> Srila Prabhupada.

Ameyatma:

I never said that you wrote such things, only that you defended the offensive comments made by others.

> As far as my defense of Dhyanakunda's text goes, I
> think I've already explained in many earlier e-mails. As a former
> member of TD, you know that Mukhya set up that conference as one on
> which it was *OK* to express doubts and to use different sources of
> support (such as science and logic) for one's words.

This is part of the problem. Neither her nor you are at all qualified to set such bogus rules and bogus ideas of what is OKAY or not. SP would not support such a forum, to discuss doubts and draw on modern science and so-called logic to dispell them? Such doubts are to be addressed in a humble and submissive mood to a senior or more advanced Vaishnav, not broadcast to the devotee public in a way that is offensive to the pure devotee and to reject the good advice given by a senior Vaishnav who supported his views by shastra in favor of less advanced devotees mental concoctions as to what 'may or may not' be right or wrong.

Guru-Sadhu-Shastra is what ISKCON is based on, from the ground up. There is no place for mental concoctions. If you want some modern non-authorized forum, do so outside of ISKCON's COM and BBT funding. And if the younger devotees do not understand this, then they must take guidance from the senior devotees who do. If they cannot do this, then they are lost. What can be done?

- > The conference
- > rules also specify that you can't tell other devotees that they're
- > going to hell or belittle them. If you think it's wrong for COM to
- > have such a conference, then please focus your critique on that
- > issue, not on my upholding the rules of the conference.

Those rules are completely bogus. They allow SP to have been belittled, but do nto allow for him to be proper defended or to properly chastise the offender. Such rules are not just useless, they are demoniac. The conference can be a good thing, but the moderation and organization of it was not. The whole mentality and consiousness behind such thinking is all mundane mental speculation and has no place in SP's ISKCON society, especially not on forums paid for by hisBBT money.

It is obvious that all those who created such forums and concocted such rules and those who are allowing it all, none of you are at all spiritually qualified to hold such forums and conferences and positions - period. On your own you can do any damn thing you want, but an official ISKCON forum cannot have non-Vedic rules which fly in the face of shastra and Vaishnav etiquette. ISKCON is based on the rule of guru-sadhu-shastra. You cannot manufacture some opposing rule that says that I or any other devotee cannot perform our solemn duty to defend the pure devotee and to speak the shastric truth by telling those who speak offensively toward the pure devotee, even those who hear such remarks and do not take action, that all will suffer hellish reactions. That is THE Rule Of Shastra - which your rules do not uphold but rather fly directly in their face. There is no tolerance to 'over rule' shastra just because you are not advanced enough to understand it properly. At the time either you or someone were saying that it was only our opinion that SP was being disrespected. Based on just our opinion we somehow had no right in your eyes to defend SP's honor because the offenders did not think they were being offensive. That is all nonsense. It is not based on personal opinion. It is a science and obviously the organizers and moderators do not sufficiently know that science. It is evident that you should not be anywhere near in charge of any such forums - especially in such positions as to make a senior Vaishnav, like Mahananda, 'distrusted'. You have overstepped the bounds of proper Vaishnav etiquette using all your own concocted rules to do so, but not the authority of shasta. How you think you, on your own, can make an older senior Vaishnav "distrusted" is simply a symptom of the bigger disease. What an offensive term to use toward a senior Vaishnav who was defending Srila Prabhupad and was simply trying to help the poor girl, Dhyanakund dd.

He rightfully spoke out in protest that SP was being disrespected and that

those who find fault with the pure devotee will go to hell. Yet you totally misunderstood and wrongly accused him of intimidating and threatening and throwing water on freedom of speech. The whole system is atmosphere is screwed up, and this incident merely is a symptom of larger problems. But, the fact that you cannot understand the actual situation is evidence that you should not be in such positions.

- > If you think it's wrong for COM to
- > have such a conference, then please focus your critique on that
- > issue, not on my upholding the rules of the conference.

That is exactly what we have been doing, mataji. Taking our complaints to the GBC. The focus - over all it is a larger issue, but, the focus of our complaint has been this incident and similar ones to try and show that there are major problems, not only on COM, but in general in the ISKCON society.

The issue we are presenting is that there is widespread acceptance and tolerance toward a disrespectful attitude toward SP (under whatever name you want to call it, like expressing doubts, etc.) that has to be dealt with strongly and publicly and thoroughly. Secondary, what is acceptable and allowable COM policy. And what qualifications one must have to moderate or organize such forums, etc. And there is evidence that shows that all of these things are stemming from other more serious problems in ISKCON. The issue of modern feminist rights in ISKCON - and a senior devotee, my friend Praghosh Prabhu, told me how these things may very well be linked to the fact that too many GBC men were contaminated by the false Gopi-Bhava mentality that has infected many from Narayan Maharaj and other Gaudiya Math influences. As SP says in the introduction to Srimad Bhagavatam, one must not enter into the highest mellows of Krsna and the Gopis until he has become fully self-realized first. If one jumps ahead prematurely one will certainly misunderstand the dealings of the Gopis in a mundane way. It may be that many GBC have been contaminated by this Gopi Bhava consciousness in which they are trying to prematurely enter into the mood of gopis. But, instead of doing so as a natural result of genuine self-realization they have become confused, as scripture and Srila Prabhupad have warned, and as they try to prematurely and falsely identify themselves as gopis, instead they are only mundanely identifying themselves with mundane female consciousness, and thus many of the GBC have simply become weak and are acting like mundane women. They are purposefully trying to indentify with the female devotees, wanting to become like one of them, as some mundane idea of becoming a gopi, rather than acting like men (souls within a male body, who have duties to act as the men of society) and become strong leaders with a take charge mentality so as to best protect and care for the souls entrapped in both male and female bodies. And, to a large extent, I agree with this idea that Praghosh has put forward. It makes much logical sense to me. So, the problem is not just with you, it is very broad and far reaching, whether that theory has credence or not, the problems are real and must be dealt with.

So, yes, focusing on doing something about it was exactly what we have been trying to do by properly approaching the GBC and demanding appropriate action be taken - at least and especially concerning SP's honor and the fact that senior devotees cannot be 'distrusted' by less senior devotees for rightfully defending Srila Prabhupad. Our concern is not just about you or the TD forum, believe me. We are demanding the GBC do something to defend SP's position. To smash people like this so-called Ananda from Cananda who offensive articles you post on Chakra.

- > Mahananda

> knew exactly what the rules were and he elected to violate them.

Yes, because such rules must be totally rejected by anyone with a clear understanding of Vaishnav principles, how could he accept them? It is stated that one must tolerate all sorts of offenses made to himself, but, if one hears offenses toward Krsna or His pure devotee, then one must defeat the offender philosophically, or tear out the tongue of the offender, or leave that place. The fact that you are still demanding that those same rules be accepted and followed is most likely why you have not heard back from Mahananda and why he says he is still not being allowed on. You are insisting that we surrender to totally mentally concocted unacceptable non-Vedic rules. It clearly shows to many of us that absolutely nothing has transpired favorably in this regards. JPS says everything has been taken care of, but NOTHING has been done.

You have not changed in your views at all, so what does he mean that you have asked for forgiveness? You ask Mahananda, publicly, for his forgiveness, then if he gives it, true spiritual progress will have been made by you.

This is why I say that you have not changed in your outlook, the operation of COM has not changed, not even your rules that keep senior devotees like Mahananda off have not changed, the people supervising COM and their standards have not changed. All that does is make many of us more resolute to keep pushing for proper actions, guided by realized souls and shastric principles and rules. Fundamental changes need to be made at appropriate levels.

> As a side bar, after he left, the forum
> became much more productive, because people could actually address
> the content of Dhyanakunda's doubts and many mature devotees, who are
> deeply attached to Srila Prabhupada, came up with some very good
> counter arguments - without blasting her in the process. A much more
> effective strategy for allaying doubts.

He was not blasting her, you have been blasting him if anything. He was warning her and others of the dangers to those who commit such offenses. The fact you can't understand these things proves, that despite your PhD, you are not qualified spiritually to be in such a position as to chastise a senior Vaishnav. If someone is walking carelessly along a path that is full of land mines and another has knowledge of it and begins shouting at them to stop proceeding or they will be blown up, that is not a threat, that is not intimidation and their shouting is not blasting. They are compassionately trying to help save that person's life and the lives of everyone who is following behind. Never, in all of shastra that I have read, ever is it acceptable to publicly air one's doubts in such a way as to openly find fault with and belittle a pure devotee. That is the elephant offense and such attitude is never at all acceptable. The results of doing are devastating to both the speaker and the hearer.

From your view point all is well now that people like Mahananda do not participate, but, in your view the current rules are also right, so what knowledgeable brahman cares for your view? Those who had read those offensive remarks about SP on that forum, then Mahananda pleading to stop it, then witnessed him being blasted as a threat, as an intimidator and as someone to be 'distrusted', then witnessed only your defending of the offender and then the GBC come to your defense, all those souls have witnessed a very grave misjustice. The whole matter begs to be properly corrected and the actual shastric facts set straight. A major disjustice has been performed.

Without doing so it will ultimately contaminate and ruin many devotee's lives. So, your view that things are now better is a blind man's view only. It is not better, and devotees must know and understand these basic principles that offensive belittlement of Krsna's pure devotees is NEVER to be tolerated and there are severe reactions for both the speaker and the hearer if the hearer does not take strong action to stop it. If one hears blasphemy of Krsna or the pure devotee and he does not take action, that he, the hearer will also fall down. Thus, Mahananda's response was fully correct and your damn rules are completely bogus.

- > I think that's it for now as far as you and I are concerned.
- > However, I'm still deeply troubled about your mean-spirited words re.
- > my spiritual master and your accusations that his behavior is
- > disgraceful. I think you owe him an apology, especially in light of
- > the fact that your letter contained so many falsehoods.

I think the both of you owe an apology to Mahananda and the whole community of Vaishnav's. Jayapataka Maharaj is my God brother, and as a senior older Vaishnav I have always acted respectfully toward him. And in this matter I remain acting with respect toward him. But, as a God-brother I can also speak directly and honestly. I will not forego honesty in these matters. So, I respectfully say that he has yet to take appropriate action.

But, just see, matanji. You are uncomfortable if I say something that you don't like about your guru JPS, and because of that you would prefer not to deal with me at all. Mahananda, myself, and many others were rightfully uncomfortable, and that is mildly putting it, with the open fault-finding and criticism of Krsna's Pure Devotee and representative, Srila Prabhupad, our direct guru maharaj. (And the criticism of shastra that has been prevalent and criticism of a number of our philosophic principles). Odd, you feel uncomfortable about what I say about JPS, but you are not uncomfortable when you heard SP being belittled? Maybe you need to strengthen your relationship with Srila Prabhupad as our prominent Siksha guru.

ys ameyatma das

51. Ameyatma dasa addresses Jayapataka Swami's points

Text 2991536 from COM]

- > From: Jayapataka Swami (GBC)
- > Date: 05-Feb-00 06:08 +0530
- > To: GBC Discussions [9466]
- > Reference: Text COM:2973283 by Bhakti Caru Swami
- > Subject: My resignation from the GBC

-
- > After the explanation of Vipramukhya Swami that she has nothing to do with
 - > this open forum and that these attacks by Ameyatma dasa and Syamasundar dasa
 - > appear to be vindictive and relentless against one person.

This is NOT about MRdd, the center of our complaint is the fact that Srila Prabhupad is the one who has been under attack. My only involvement, from my first post on the Topical Discussion, to now, has been directed only at trying to defend his honor. I do not have time to waste dealing with false and silly accusations that I am only vindictively trying to attack some poor mataji. .

Why no action on your part to deal with the fact that Srila Prabhupad was

belittled? Do you consider him only a colorful eccentric? Do you also think he had wrong views about so many things, like astrology?, women's rights, man going to the moon? Do you also agree that he made so many mistakes in his books - such that it is justified to belittle him for this and feel justified to try and find other faults in his teachings? Do you agree that this then justifies that we can therefore accept or reject at will what he has taught? Do you agree with these sentiments?

The above is what is at the heart of our anguish, Prabhu. These were the issues that I and Mahananda and so many others have been dealing with on COM. Not some feeble idea that we are only vindictively trying to personally attack some poor mataji. The fact that there is little discussion about the real issues and only these petty issues being dealt with does nothing but add more and more to our frustration in dealing with you and the GBC on this issue. My only concern has been the above issues and how to properly deal with the hellish mentality that was prominent on some of the COM conferences.

Why, in the past 3-4 months of discussing this, you keep avoiding the heart of the matter, Srila Prabhupad's honor and the fact that he and the foundation of our faith in shastra and guru have been under attack?

I am only concerned with the philosophical issues of imbibing in all complete faith in shastra and in Srila Prabhupad, and the issues of SP's proper position being properly honored and respected. I am only interested that strong preaching be done to defeat the maya in the hearts of those who misunderstand the position of the pure devotee and Srila Prabhupad's unique position. That is the heart of the matter. Not MRdd individually.

A number of devotees, such as this Ananda from Canada, and others, had made offensive remarks about Srila Prabhupad, belittling his position and ridiculing his position on astrology, the moon landings, women's intelligence, rights etc. That got many of us upset and I and others wrote in defense of Srila Prabhupad's teachings and his positions, and shastra, which were all under attack. That is how I got involved with the forum on which MRdd was the organizer of. Someone sent to me an offensive post by this Ananda from Canada and so I joined the conference so that I could respond to it in defense of Srila Prabhupad. I did not get involved out of any thing personal with anyone, except to defend my guru maharaj.

Then Dhyanakund wrote posts that were very offensive Mahananda, who is your God brother, a Prabhupad disciple, rightfully protested and rightfully, in accordance with shastra and SP's teachings, spoke out that those who offend SP, the pure devotees, will go to hell. .

MRdd then labeled Mahananda as 'distrusted' and asked for him to be removed. She called his defense of Srila Prabhupad "intimidation", and she, to this day, stands by those same comments and ideas. Because of that, I say nothing has been done at all to address the real issue. She refereed to his comment that the offenders will go to hell as being an unacceptable threat against the other devotee (who was making the offensive comments). I am not a new bhakta, Prabhu, her position and stand is totally wrong. Period. Dhyanakunda's own guru Krsna Ksetra Prabhu agreed that she was offensive and deserved the chastisement she received, yet MRdd defended her. This doubly shows how off MRdd is.

That, maharaj, is how MRdd got into the middle of this whole ordeal. We (I, least) are not vindictively out after her, to attack her, we are upset because Srila Prabhupad's position has been attacked. She is involved in

the matter because she wound up defending the offender and she attacked those who tried to defend Srila Prabhupad as pouring cold water on free speech, of intimidating and threatening, of being hateful, etc, when in truth all he or we were doing was properly defending Srila Prabhupad, and following proper Vaishnav etiquette in doing so.

Seeing no other recourse to remedy the situation we took it to the GBC to ask that something be done. Which, again, was the proper thing for us to do. And nothing has been done, that I can see, that has changed MRdd's position or those of the many other devotees who think like her. Another reason why she gets singled out is that she has strong influence on the editorial policies of Chakra and was the organizer of several COM conferences, and she writes prolifically on COM putting herself into the middle of these debates. Anyway, she still feels that she is justified in attacking Mahananda, calling his preaching (done on the basis of shastra), as being intimidation.

The fact that you keep defending MRdd's position and that you don't deal with the offenses made to Srila Prabhupad or with the fact that your disciple has wrongly dealt with Mahananda and others and taken the wrong side on the above issues is most disturbing. Must we conclude that you are in agreement with her that even if Srila Prabhupad is being belittled publicly that no one should speak out that the offender will go to hell? Do you agree that devotees like Mahananda should be labeled as 'distrusted' and not allowed to preach? Etc., etc. I keep telling myself there is no way that you also think like that, but then, rather than deal with these issues you are now only labeling me and Shyam as vindictive attackers of some mataji. Well, then, what can I say. Words fail me. I hope this will be my last post on this matter because I do not have the time to deal with it anymore.

As far as my linking the open forum with MRdd, I wrote another letter to her in which I apologized for that, and I sent that letter to you and the GBC conference as well. After all, she does have editorial responsibilities for the site, she has made decisions as to what articles are posted and what is not, so I (improperly) assumed that she had full knowledge of the open forum, but that is simply a side issue. The real issue still has yet to be dealt with. As I said in that letter, the fact remains that nothing was done about the real issues and that is why I wrote the other letter and tied in the link with the open forum. I wanted to make sure this issue is not swept under the rug.

ys ameyatma das

52. Ameyatma dasa writes to GBC regarding latest revelation by Mrdd that COM has been taken out of the control of the BBT and GBC

From: "Ameyatma.AC BSP"
My Dear Members of the GBC,
Please accept my obeisances. All glories to Srila Prabhupad.

I got this recent reply from MRdd. Many of us were upset that COM was out of hand and that the GBC must do something to correct it. And were upset because the GBC seems to be so weak they weren't able to do anything. Now it seems the rebels have taken another step to assure the GBC cannot and will not do anything. Here is what MRdd just wrote me (my quote begin with >>, hers with >) My current comments to the GBC have nothing in front:

From: "Maria Ekstrand" <ekstrand@slip.net>
To: "Ameyatma.AC BSP" <ameyatma@iname.com>

Sent: Friday, February 04, 2000 3:49 AM
Subject: Re: Your letter

> >Guru-Sadhu-Shastra is what ISKCON is based on, from the ground up. There is
> >no place for mental concoctions. If you want some modern non-authorized
> >forum, do so outside of ISKCON's COM and BBT funding.
>
> We are. The COM is not under GBC control and now it's no longer run
> by the BBT either. It's been leased to the system operators and will
> be financed by user donations. So I guess there is no more issue to
> discuss.

So, BBT is now LEASING COM facilities to the Sys Ops and Organizers, my understanding is that this just occurred in the past 24 hrs or so.

I consider these devotees to be rebellious and unsubmitive to authority. She does not argue that COM was not functioning under the rules of shastra, and she says it was not under GBC control. So, now the COM is 'officially'and 'technically' no longer under the BBT. So now the COM forums and moderators can snub their noses at the GBC and shastra and senior Vaishnav's and can go about their concocted form or so-called preaching and setting up their own rules totally independently of what senior ISKCON member's or the GBC's objections.

To me, all of this sounds like a rebellious uprising. And a 'sneaky' way of COM operators to get around being under the authority of the GBC.

However, I do not - AT ALL - see this as a sign that the GBC is now 'off the hook'. NO Way. COM was once an integral part of ISKCON. Devotees identified COM as being ISKCON. The fact that it is now 'so-called' independent of GBC control does not make the real problem go away, rather it now makes it more of a mess and more difficult to deal with.

It also illustrates that because the GBC was too slow in acting and/or too weak to act, that now the independent rebels have taken steps to become more independent and make it harder for sincere devotees to act. The GBC should have taken strong action many many months ago at the first signs of problems, They should have made all efforts to take control of the situation. Instead they left it to less senior devotees and women to resolve. With the results, they now declare their full independence from the GBC.

But, are they fully independent? If that is their attitudes then the GBC must proclaim them NOT to be ISKCON devotees and their gurus should disown them. Why, because how can they be the disciples of ISKCON gurus if they are acting outside the authority of the GBC?

> > but an official ISKCON forum
> >cannot have non-Vedic rules which fly in the face of shastra and Vaishnav
> >etiquette.
>
> That's fine. See above. COM is not an ISKCON forum. They're independent.

Notice that Mad. Radha does not argue that her rules fly in the face of Shastra and Vaishnav etiquette, rather she remarks that by definition it is "Fine" with her. She now argues that the problem is solved because now the BBT only leases facilities to COM operators and the whole thing is no longer under GBC control. (Great job, GBC men, you inaction has really done wonders to taking a small problem and let it fester into a many times worse problem).

> >the fact that you cannot understand the actual situation is evidence that
> >you should not be in such positions.
>
> I have no position in ISKCON, so there is no problem.
>
> >Fundamental changes need
> >to be made at appropriate levels.
> Couldn't agree more and I'm very glad that such fundamental changes
> were finally made at COM.
>
> >You are uncomfortable if I say something that you
> >don't
> >like about your guru JPS, and because of that you would prefer not to deal
> >with me at all.
>
> True. I'd be very glad if I never had to see your name or hear from
> you again. But I'm not telling you that you're going to hell for the
> way you're speaking about and to my guru. It would have been much
> better for everyone if Mahananda had done the same. Then we would
> have welcomed him on the forum. But he was unwilling to stick to its
> rules. Thus he is no longer on.

What have I said that was offensive to my God brother Jayapataka Maharaja, Maharaj, if you are offended, please accept my worthless obeisances. But, I don't see my being upset that in my view you did not properly understand the real problem and therefore did not take proper action in this matter as being grounds for offending you. Not just you, I say the whole GBC body failed to act.

But, I remain very upset that you have not instructed your disciple that she is totally wrong and she is the one making offenses by insisting on such non-Vedic demoniac rules for running her forums. Rules which enable her to make your own God brother 'distrusted' for having stood up in defense of Srila Prabhupad's honor.

To this day, I do not see that MRdd had publicly agreed that she was wrong in defending the offensive statements made by Dhyanakund, and she has not asked Mahananda for forgiveness for calling him an intimidator and a threat for his proper preaching to defend SP. She still is sticking to her rules that allow belittlement of and offenses to be made to SP while not allowing senior devotees to speak shastric truth and defend the pure devotee. So, I say, nothing has been done. MRdd does not accept that she has done anything wrong, and keeps insisting that Mahananda and I and devotees like us, that we are all wrong.

Jayapataka Maharaj, whose side are you on? And this question is for all the GBC. Do you support devotees like MRdd and agree that devotees like myself and Mahananda are the ones who are wrong? That devotees can speak offensively about Srila Prabhupad and that we must agree to their rules that we must not speak on the basis of shastra to defend SP and to warn the offenders they will suffer hellish results for their offenses.

But, silence is the voice of complicity. And the fact that JPS and the GBC did not act swiftly and strongly in dealing with this matter, the ones who are truly the independent rebels, they have taken it as a sign of complicity. MRdd either feels she has the full blessings of her guru and GBC in what she is doing, or she is knowingly acting completely in defiance. If she does not have JPS's or the GBC support, then it is the belated duty of the GBC to start blasting the real truth on these matters.

It is imperative that the GBC take a strong public stand and lay down the law - openly on COM (what is left of it, if they will be allowed to do so) and wherever they can. To strongly uphold shastra and to defend SP's honor. And to individually deal with their disciples and give them the needed guidance to show them where they are wrong.

Either that, or your continued silence must be taken as your complicity with all that is going on. That you see nothing wrong for less advanced devotees to make senior Prabhupad men 'distrusted' because he will not conform to non-shastric rules that forbade him to defend Srila Prabhupad's honor, etc. Which side are you people on?

> > Maybe you need to
> >strengthen your relationship with Srila Prabhupad as our prominent Siksha
> >guru.
>
>
> Maybe you need to worry about your won spiritual lives, your own
> morals and stop throwing stones. Your glasshouse has some awfully
> thin walls. You should be very happy that those of us who object to
> your constant lies and offenses don't sink to your level.

My constant lies? What ??? I sent you all my previous letters to her. I was only trying to preach what is acceptable and what is not. In fact, what did I say that was so offensive? I simply said that she needs to strengthen her relationship with ISKCON's Founder-Acharya as the pre-eminent Siksha guru and she accuses me of 'throwing stones'?

To address a recent snide comment made by my God Brother Bir Krsna prabhu, who is in need of psychological help here? Who has the problem understanding our Vaishnav philosophy?

> Yours in the service of ISKCON's abused and mistreated devotees,
> Madhusudani dasi

She is doing her share at abusing and mistreating her senior God uncles by making devotees like Mahananda 'distrusted' etc., etc.

In concluding I would like to say that the GBC now needs to establish a separate ISKCON funded internet presence. COM is no longer under GBC authority (on a separate front I think the GBC should work at reclaiming COM as ISKCON property - and the GBC and gurus should work to bring it under ISKCON control simply by setting down the law that those who operate it by rules that are unacceptable to the GBC and go against shastra must change their rules and act submissively - individually, to the will of the GBC, or they are no longer to be seen as members of ISKCON - period, so the GBC can and must still exhibit control over it's members) If that cannot be done easily, then the GBC should fund an official ISKCON forum. CHAKRA is not under GBC control. (What is? Without a strong presence it is like a free for all out there - with no solid direction, no solid authority - Mad. Radhas are totally free to make their own rules and mistreat older devotees however they feel fit). The GBC need to get a loud voice of authority on the internet. CHAKRA, in turn, publishes Ananda's article in the midst of all this that simply added more offenses toward SP.

ys ameyatma das

53. Nayana-ranjana das refutes some of the comments made by Dhyanakunda d.d. on Topical Discussion conference:

[Text 2712074 from COM]

Mother Dhyanakunda wrote:

- > Prabhupada
- > first exhibits a very negative attitude toward one Richard, and a few
- > sentences later, he becomes quite positive about him and sees good
- > qualities in him. What has changed?

Mother Dhyanakunda, please for God's sake stop giving your mindless conclusions about Prabhupada. You can make your observations but we don't need your offensive conclusions. I feel your observation is highly inappropriate and your conclusions offensive not only for yourself but also for all the readers. Before making an offensive observation & conclusion regarding a great devotee of the Lord in a public forum, one should think about it atleast 1000 times.

Let's try to study the following conversation:

- > Aksayananda: That boy Richard in Radha-kunda.
- >
- > Prabhupada: Rascal. That is his bad association. Therefore I say don't
- > follow these so-called Radha-kunda babajis. Nara-kunda babaji. And they
- > smoke bidi. I have seen. Richard is still there?

I do not accept this as a very negative attitude towards Richard as mother Dhyanakunda says. I accept it a sign of great compassion of Srila Prabhupada for Richard. Here Prabhupada is calling Richard, a rascal because of his bad association with the Radha-kunda babajis. Infact one can see Prabhupada's extreme love & compassion for Richard when he calls him a rascal. Because he is pained in hearing about the foolishness of Richard, because he wants his real welfare, he is calling him a rascal (sometimes father chastises a son like that for the welfare of the son). Because Prabhupada has love for him, he is calling him a rascal, otherwise why would he even bother discussing about his situation.

- > Prabhupada: So he does not bring that?
- >> Harikesa: Yes, he has money all the time.
- >
- > Aksayananda: Dhananjaya prabhu, he went to see him and he said he was
- > dying. He's supposed to pass off. And he said that he had written a will
- > and on the will he had left most of his money to ISKCON.
- >
- > Prabhupada: Accha?
- >
- > Caranaravindam: He loves you very much. Actually, he's very attracted to
- > you Srila Prabhupada.
- >
- > Prabhupada: Oh. Why does he not come to us? He likes Radha-kunda.
- >
- > Caranaravindam: He loves Radha-kunda.
- >
- > Prabhupada: Determination. No, if he's in difficulty he may come. We can
- > take care of him.

Please try to study this. When Prabhupada was informed that Richard was not spending all his money on the babajis and instead giving much of it to the preaching movement ISKCON was still attracted to SP, obviously this was good news.

On what basis do you think Prabhupada has become quite positive about him? Just due to this word 'determination'. But Prabhupada did not say whether Richard's determination was good or bad. Prabhupada continues, 'if he is in difficulty...' means that there is a chance even now that he may come in difficulty because of his following a faulty process. And also 'determination' and 'he may come' indicate that Prabhupada meant that he is so determined that we cannot force him but when he comes we can take care of him.

Also a pure devotee always sees the good qualities in others. So when he heard that inspite of everything Richard loves him and was donating his money to ISKCON, Prabhupada naturally would have developed a soft-corner for him in his heart. Like a rough example, Lord Caitanya rejected Devananda Pandit because of his grievous offense against Srivasa Thakura but developed a soft-corner for him when he heard that Devananda Pandit had served Srila Vakreswara Pt. when Vakreswara Pt. had collapsed while dancing. Infact this conversation reveals the greatness & exemplary of Srila Prabhupada. It is great misfortune that this very conversation has been used by your goodself to create doubt in the transcendental moods of Srila Prabhupada. Only a pure devotee can know another pure devotee.

"It is said, vaisnavera kriya, mudra vijneha na bujhaya: one should not be astonished to see the activities of exalted, liberated Vaisnavas. As one should not be misled by the activities of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, one should also not be misled by the activities of His devotees."

> What has changed?

By saying so, you may also imply that Prabhupada was duplicitous in this dealings. After he heard about the money Richard was giving to ISKCON, he became soft towards Richard. But duplicitousness comes when there is personal self-interest involved. We have seen Prabhupada managed so much money and a big society and engaged everything in Krsna's service. There was never any scandal from his side because he never did anything for himself simply for the mission of preaching KC. And that is why Krsna gave him more & more.

SB 6.17,34-35 purport

> "Bad things means Western type of civilization,"
> etc. Very strong, super simple black-and-white general statements. Where
> ordinary people would soften their statements by saying, "as far as I
> know," "I am convinced that," "to some degree," "in this respect,"

Can you refute this absolutely "Bad things means Western type of civilization"? Why should Prabhupada follow your opinion? He is acarya and has fully freedom to say the truth with full conviction. Infact seeing the 100% conviction in Prabhupada's words which is based on jnana & vijnana, many have become attracted to his books and have become devotees.

> This kind is what bothers me, personally, perhaps more than the simpler
> kinds. I just have a big problem trusting persons who label others so
> easily and so unpredictably.

You have no right to pass your judgements on what Prabhupada should do and not do depending on what you like or don't like. If you have a problem in trusting Srila Prabhupada then that is your fault and it is a very dangerous signal in your spiritual life. This doubt may soon end up uprooting your tender creeper of devotional service if it is not eradicated immediately.

- > I am ready to believe the source of his certainty is direct link with
- > Krsna's absolute knowledge, *if* it can be proven he was absolutely right
- > each time.

Why 'if'? Prabhupada is certainly in direct touch with Krsna irrespective of whether he was absolutely right each time or not. Srila Jiva Goswami says in the Krsna Sandarbha that sometimes there are some apparent faults manifested even in the person of the pure devotees just so that the insincere atheists or followers are bewildered and give up whereas the faith of the sincere followers is strengthened. Just like Krsna does somethings deliberately to bewilder the atheists.

Anyway I am quitting this conference because I just can't tolerate such belittling of our founder-acharya.

Your servant,
Nayana-ranjana das

54. Topical Discussion Moderators call for letter writing campaign to allow discussion of "untouchable subjects"

- > Text COM:2737637 (68 lines)
- > From: Dvaipayana Vyasa (das) RSD (Belgrade - YU)
- > Date: 29-Oct-99 11:17
- > To: Topical Discussions [1071]
- > Subject: Attempts to silence members of Topical Discussions
- > -----
- > Dear prabhus, matajis, ladies, gentlemen and everyone,
- >
- > Recently, several attempts have been made to silence certain
- > members of this
- > conference - to stop them from voicing their opinion on Topical
- > Discussions - in a rather dirty way. Certain persons who did not like the
- > fact that on TD a lot of otherwise untouchable subjects may be discussed,
- > approached gurus of persons whose posts they did not like.
- >
- > We had reactions from more than one guru (of conference members), and we
- > suppose that we will have more of it in the future.
- >
- > If you are concerned about someone's spiritual life, and the person
- > repeatedly rejects your offers to help, then approaching the person's guru
- > may stem from the motivation to help. We have, however, reasons to believe
- > that in this case, the motivation is primarily not to help but to intimidate
- > and silence.
- >
- > We, the conference organizers, wanted to bring this matter to your
- > attention. If the general audience knows about it, chances are that this
- > conference can continue in the intended way - that people here will be able
- > to speak without fear in the future as they are now (though even now it is
- > not completely without fear, sadly...).
- >
- > When people know about this, they may do something. Also, those who like to
- > do their work behind the scenes, contacting gurus of others and doing other
- > activities of that kind, might not feel so nice knowing that this is exposed
- > to the public.
- >
- > We personally consider such attempts as very harmful, as something not worth
- > devotees of the Lord.

>
> Yet in our society (ISKCON) as it is, such attempts may even have results -
> if some guru does not want his name (or initials behind disciple's name)
> connected to any heated discussion.
>
> These persons (who want to prevent thoughts of others) may also try to
> exercise pressure on COM sysop, on the GBC and/or the BBT trustees, or
> wherever they can, in an attempt to shut down the conference (or transform
> it into something more to their liking) or have outspoken members removed
> from COM.
>
> We will try to continue our work, in hope that it will make entire devotee
> community a better place to live, without fear and repressions, but with
> love and support. There will always be doubts in any healthy community. We
> believe that from the free expressions of our thoughts and feelings, we can
> offer each other support and our society can grow into a healthy one, which
> will be an attractive option for people who are interested in Krsna Consciousness.
>
> Please support these efforts and support all those who participate in this -
> they will need it. You may elect to show your support in private letters or
> phone calls, either to devotees with whom you agree, or to leaders with whom
> you have good relationships. You may of course also chose to make your
> support in more public way. This is a crucial time for our society and there
> are many external forces trying to tear us apart. Please help us to ensure
> that we can have supportive and loving dealings within our society and allow
> all of our voices to be heard. We believe that this is the only way in which
> we can remain strong and survive.
>
> If your spiritual masters express concern about your participation in our
> conference, feel free to invite them to join the forum and see for themselves.
>
> Thank you.
>
> Your servants and conference co-organizers
>
> Dvaipayana Vyasa das Madhusudani Radha devi dasi
> (Text COM:2737637) -----

55. Hari Sauri Prabhu points out that anyone who has seen the texts put out Madhusudhani Radhe dd can see that she is faithless.

Letter COM:2834839 (11 lines)
From: Hari Sauri (das) ACBSP
Date: 06-Dec-99 06:18 -0500
Subject: Madhusudani Radha

> We have faith that you are a sincere follower of SP but you have shown
> that she doesn't even want to follow your example what to speak of Srila
> Prabhupada's.

Anyone who has seen the texts she puts out knows this to be true.
She appears to have little or no faith in the guru paramapara and thinks her own mundane intelligence to be superior. She needs correction (of course, Krsna will eventually correct her anyway, but at least her guru should try).

Your humble servant,
Hari-sauri dasa
(Text COM:2834839) -----

Letter COM:2847171 (72 lines)
From: Hari Sauri (das) ACBSP
Date: 10-Dec-99 12:00 -0500
Subject: Re: Jagat's text on VNN

Dear Brahmatirtha prabhu,

Please accept my humble obeisances. All glories to Srila Prabhupada!
Thank you for your recent letter regarding the controversy surrounding VAST and its contributors.

> It has come to my attention that you have some concerns about VAST.

Yes, after seeing some of the postings there I, and many others, are concerned that there is a trend, especially over the internet, to minimize Srila Prabhupada and his teachings especially over issues such as women and the gurukula system. If you say that you are able to properly monitor such discussions so that Srila Prabhupada is not criticised or minimized then I accept that.

However, when you say that Madhusudhani Radha is not doing this then I have doubts. I have seen several postings of hers that indicate that she does not have full faith in Srila Prabhupada and wants to try and rationalize his words with her own mundane intelligence. I am not convinced by your words that this is not so nor do I think the present concerns have come about simply because Shyamasundar prabhu is simply mudslinging in a personal vendetta against her. He has provided ample textual evidence to show that his concerns are legitimate and that if we do not take some action now to stem this trend it may well engulf us at some point in the future.

My experience with Srila Prabhupada was that he was very quick to nip philosophical deviations in the bud as he did with the gopi bhava club and with the ex-Nitai dasa. I was with him in 1977 on the roof of the lotus building when the then Hiranyagarbha came before him to read some English versification of the Bhagavad-gita verses that he had written. Srila Prabhupada listened, approved and suggested they be printed in BTG. Then he spent 10 minutes telling Hiranyagarbha to be careful to not jump over his guru and become more intelligent than him. There was no apparent reason why he said this at the time, I was slightly puzzled why he brought the subject up without any apparent prompt. Later events show that he was prescient in understanding this man's real tendency and seeing the real condition of his heart. Now I see that the same man is given a forum for spouting out his offenses within our organization. I understand that you have warned him and do monitor his postings, but nevertheless giving him a voice does tend to legitimize him in the eyes of the devotees. I am not at all sure that we should be doing this.

At any rate, I don't want to get too deeply embedded in a back and forth on this. I do wish that there is sufficient awareness in our Society so that we are well prepared to deal with attacks both subtle and gross against our founder Acarya Srila Prabhupada and I take Shyamasundar prabhu's postings as a conscience raising effort for the protection of Srila Prabhupada and his teachings. You may or may not like it but I do believe he has a legitimate right to raise the issue and bring it to the attention of ISKCON authorities. As much as Madhusudhani Radha wants her right to free discussions and expression, then surely Shyamasundar prabhu has the right to this also. One thing I have noticed is that Madhusudhani Radha is not nearly as liberal in her outlook towards those who disagree with her as she is with her own self.

My feeling is that in order to clear the air it would be good to have her provide some written answers as to what she understands as the real meanings of Srila Prabhupada's comments on the key issues in question i.e. women's intelligence compared to men, and the whole issue of whether Srila Prabhupada is to "blame" for what has happened in the gurukula. There may be a couple of other issues also, such as Srila Prabhupada's view of modern material scientists, his unquestioning acceptance of the statements of the previous acaryas and the Bhagavatam, Vedic cosmology etc.

Let a panel set some questions to her, let her answer them and then let the panel decide whether she really has faith in Srila Prabhupada and KC or not. Then let the appropriate action be taken. Either she gets the OK or she gets corrected. This seems to me to be the best way to clear up the present controversy.

Your humble servant,

Hari-sauri dasa

(Text COM:2847171) -----